Vol I of this magazine was published under the title The Religious Cabinet.

Library of
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY

BRIGHTON, MASSACHUSETTS

LIBRARY
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
BRIGHTON MASS.

THE

UNITED STATES

CATHOLIC MAGAZINE.

MARCH, 1843.

VOIGT'S HISTORY OF GREGORY VII.

Histoire du Pape Gregoire VII, et de son siècle, d'aprés les monuments originaux. Par J. Voigt, profess. a l'universitè de Hall. Traduite de l'Allemand, par M. l'Abbé Jager. Paris, 1838. 2 vols. 8vo.

History of Pope Gregory VII, and of his age, from original documents. By J. Voigt, Prof. at the University of Hall. Translated from the German by the Abbé Jager. Paris, 1838. 2 vols. 8vo.

THE age of Pope Gregory VII, was one of peculiar interest, crowded with great and important events. It was an age of transition. After the civil convulsions which followed the subjugation of Europe by the northmen in the fifth century, society, as if exhausted by over exertion, seems to have settled down into a species of lethargy in the tenth century, allowed by all to have been the darkest and most dreary of all the period called the middle ages. The eleventh century presents us the picture of society again struggling into form. To attain this form, it was necessary again to pass through the storm of revolution. Commotions in society are sometimes as necessary for its moral health, as storms are in nature for the purification of the atmosphere. Whoever will take the trouble to compare the tenth with the twelfth century, must be convinced that during the intervening period "a great man has passed," and that his passage has been marked by great events. That great man was Hildebrand, afterwards Gregory VII; and the great events are those which Mr. Voigt so graphically describes in his history. This embraces the period of thirty-nine years, from the birth of the emperor Henry IV, in 1046, to the death of Gregory in 1085.

Mr. Voigt could not have chosen a more interesting or important subject, and few could have done it greater justice. His history is not confined to Gregory; along with him he portrays the various remarkable personages who flourished at the same time, and with most of whom Gregory was thrown into frequent contact. Among these, the chief is Henry IV, of Germany, the exact antithesis of Gregory in all things,—*infamous* for every thing for which *he* was *famous*. He and all the others appear before us like finished *tableaux* from a master hand,—their features and form so clearly marked, that they remain fixed in the memory, and will ever after be recognized as old acquaintances. Great men often appear in *groupes*, like the stars in heaven; and, among the great cotemporaries of Gregory, we may mention St. Peter Damian, St. Anselm, bishop of Lucca, and Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino, in Italy; St. Hugh of Cluni, and Cardinal Hugh de Die, in France; Lanfranc,

archbishop of Canterbury, and William the Conqueror, in England; and Anno of Cologne, Rodolph, duke of Suabia, and Otto of Nordheim, in Germany. In the south of Italy, the famous Chevalier Robert Guiscard is seen extending the Roman power almost as much as William the Conqueror does in England; and the attentive reader will not fail to remark a great similarity in the characters and fortunes of these two fierce, but chivalrous Norman chieftains. He will also detect in the life, position in relation to Henry IV, splendid designs, varied fortunes, and remarkable death of the great Anno, archbishop of Cologne, many traits common to him with the great Cardinal Wolsey of England; though, if the comparison be strictly carried out, the palm will, perhaps, be awarded to Anno. Had Henry IV listened to *his* counsels, and not been guided too much by the ambitious Adalbert, bishop of Bremen, and others, the history of the eleventh century would have been very different. If the reader be fond of drawing parallels, he may find many things in the life, character and varied adventures of the great Otto of Nordheim, to remind him of that pink of medieval chivalry, Richard *Cœur de Lion.* Finally, in the excellent Empress Agnes, the mother of Henry IV, he will discover the most estimable traits of character; and in the famous Matilda of Tuscany, the particular friend of Gregory, he will find all the qualities which constitute a great and good princess. She combined in a remarkable degree the coolness, firmness, and zeal of Gregory with the warlike talents and impetuous bravery* of Otto of Nordheim.

All the characters reappear under the pen of Mr. Voigt, fresh, and, as it were, instinct with life; and it requires but little exertion of fancy, to behold them again acting over before us their respective parts in history, Gregory VII being the great master spirit and actor, whose influence is felt by them all. Few men, perhaps, have been more differently judged by their cotemporaries, and by posterity, than this great pontiff. That he was a great man with transcendent genius, and that he did great things all readily admit: and Napoleon, an excellent judge of human greatness, showed his discrimination when he said: *"if I were not Napoleon, I would wish to be Gregory VII!"*

By his enemies he has been represented as an ambitious man, who aimed at universal dominion, both civil and ecclesiastical, reckless of the means for attaining his object. Many Catholics have thought that he pushed the claims of his see too far. The Church has erected altars to his memory, as to one of the most devoted champions of her liberty and rights, and one of the greatest promoters of stainless purity among her clergy. It is a singular stroke of Divine Providence, that perhaps the best apology for the course thus pursued by the Church, comes to us from a Protestant pen, and from that Germany too, with which Gregory sustained so long and arduous a struggle. Mr. Voigt has defended him, not, as he had been attacked, by mere *declamation,* but by the evidence of *facts* drawn from cotemporary writers, such as Lambert, Paul Bernried, Domnizo, Berthold of Constance, Leo Ostiensis, Herrman, Fiorentini, Aventin, Cardinal Arago, and others. He has thoroughly sifted the testimony of these authors, and presented the facts in a chronological order, but yet woven into a narrative almost as interesting as any work of fiction. Though a Protestant, yet he is so just and moderate, and withal so accurate, that the severe critic, Abbé Jager, who translated his work into French, found little of importance to correct, and less to add to the narrative; and besides a remarkably well written, well reasoned, and highly wrought introductory essay of one hundred pages, his notes are chiefly valuable, as exhibiting the original text where Mr. Voigt had only referred to it. The manner of Mr. Voigt is very similar to that of the great English historian, Lingard, embracing many *facts* and little *theory;* while his style, though less terse and condensed, is perhaps more lively, and his narrative more detailed and interesting.

It is not our purpose to write a lengthy

* See Voigt, (vol. ii, p. 436), for a curious instance of her skill in arms, when, at the head of her troops, she surprized and defeated Henry's army in Lombardy.

review of Mr. Voigt's work, which we hope soon to see in an English dress. We wish merely to direct attention to the new light which so unexceptionable a witness has shed upon the character and actions of a man than whom few have been less known, or more misrepresented. Gregory had to sustain a two-fold relation to the world; the one *spiritual* to the Church, of which he was the visible head, the other *temporal*, to civil society, in the framework of which he was an important part. Our object is to show, from the facts which Mr. Voigt alleges and proves, that in both these capacities his influence was highly beneficial, while his motives were of the purest and most exalted nature. His great idea was, *to purify the Church, and through its agency to reform and civilize society;* and his acts were just such as the condition of the times required for the attainment of these two great objects. The chief fault of those who have censured him has been that they have judged his conduct, not by the circumstances of his own time and the jurisprudence which obtained then, but by the maxims and ideas of the present day, than which nothing could be more unjust.

I. Our blessed Redeemer foretold (Matt. xviii) that scandals should come; and even under his own eyes, and in the college of apostles, taught immediately by himself, a most grievous scandal was given by that traitorous disciple who sold his Divine Master. It was not to be expected that the members of the Church, even the ministers of its altars, should be all of them stainless. It was not promised that *the gates of hell should* not rage against the Church, but that they should *not prevail* (Matt. xvi). The storm was to howl fiercely around the ship of the Church, while pursuing her voyage over the stormy ocean of life, but in the hour of her greatest peril, when every thing would threaten shipwreck, and the timid would exclaim: "*Lord, save us, or we perish,*" Jesus would arise from his apparent slumber, extend his hand over the boiling waves, command the winds and the sea, and suddenly there should come a great calm (St. Matt. viii, 25, 26). This miracle has been renewed in all the great emergencies of the Church. "*She may be attacked, she cannot be conquered.*" Persecution had tried her, and she came out fresher and brighter than ever. Heresy had assailed her on all sides, and yet she had gained the victory. At the period of which we are speaking, a flood of immorality broke in upon her, penetrating even within the sacred chancel of her sanctuary, and from this new and most terrible ordeal she was destined likewise to come out unharmed and unsullied. Perhaps the preservation of the Church, under such circumstances, is a greater miracle of God's providence, than any other recorded in her annals.

Gregory VII was the chief instrument employed by Divine Providence for the correction of the crying moral evils of his age. His vast mind immediately perceived the source from which this torrent of disorders flowed; and he directed all his efforts for nearly thirty-six years, towards drying it up. The Church had unworthy ministers and had to weep over many immoralities, even at the foot of her altars, because she had been enslaved by the princes of the earth,—her canons contemned, her liberties crushed, and her very sanctuaries sacrilegiously invaded by those who were clothed with the civil power. The right of investitures, claimed chiefly by the emperors of Germany, was the principal cause of all the evils of the Church. The emperors having richly endowed the bishopricks and abbeys, claimed the right of nominating to them, and of investing the subject thus nominated with the *insignia* of his office. The new incumbent took an oath of fealty, which required among other things that he should join the standard of his sovereign with his armed retainers, whenever called on to do so. In the appointment to bishopricks, more regard was often had to birth, and military talents, than to the virtues and learning required by the canons. What was still worse, these preferments were often purchased by money, and the most unworthy men were thus thrust into the holy places. Under the wicked and dissolute Henry IV, simony and consequent immorality became the order of the day in Germany and northern Italy, where his power

in this matter was more baneful, because less questioned. The Church was thus disgraced with wicked ministers, because "the princes of the world *had thrust them on her.*"

The right of investiture was manifestly an usurpation of the German emperors and other princes, at least in the sense in which it was understood and practised by them. It was viewed, not only by Gregory, but by many other holy men of the time, such as St. Anselm of Lucca,* and St. Peter Damian,† as the chief cause of all the evils which they so much deplored. It was in direct opposition to the enactments of the ancient canons regarding the election of bishops. These secured to the Church the right of choosing her own ministers, and perfect freedom in the exercise of that right. If the people often co-operated in the election of bishops during the first centuries, it was more as witnesses of the good qualities of the candidates than as electors; and perhaps one cause of the modification of discipline in this respect was the well grounded fear that when the people would become more numerous and perhaps less pious, popular clamor might impair the liberty of election. Princes never had the right of nomination to bishopricks, without the consent and concurrence of the Church. The thirtieth canon of those called "the Apostolic," believed by the learned to exhibit pretty accurately the discipline of the three first centuries of the Church, pronounces sentence of deposition against bishops who received their sees from princes. The fourth canon of the great council of Nice, held in 325, regulates the manner of appointing bishops by all those of the province, or by at least three of them—without even alluding to any right of the people or of princes in this matter.‡ The twenty-second canon of the eighth general council held at Constantinople in 870, goes still farther, and pronounces an anathema against any "lay prince," who would interfere in the "election or promotion of any patriarch, metropolitan, or bishop, so as to prevent its canonical freedom."§ Many other authorities could be produced to prove that the claim set up by the princes of the eleventh century, not only had no sanction from the Church, but was in the very face of all its rights and laws. By being liberal to the Church, temporal princes acquired no right to enslave it, and to introduce into its bosom the feudal, on the ruins of the canon law.

Yet this was precisely what was attempted to be done; and for resisting this usurpation and contending strongly until death for the liberty of the Church, Gregory has sustained so much obloquy! Could he have done otherwise without betraying his duty, and, to use his own strong language, "by satisfying the caprices of princes, being hurled with them into the abyss?"* So far was this pretended right of investiture carried, that the German emperors even asserted it in regard to the Roman pontiff himself, thereby seeking to crush the liberty of the Church in its head—in the only one able effectually to resist the ever encroaching usurpation! The emperors had more than once attempted to elect and depose Popes at will; but they always met with powerful resistance from the Church, and never succeeded in causing more than temporary confusion. Sometimes called to the "eternal city," as its natural protectors, to quell popular insurrection, or to assert the liberty of the Church, they often went beyond the mere office of protection, and sought to rule in spiritual as well as in temporal matters. In one of his trips to Rome (after the middle of the tenth century), Otho the Great, emperor of Germany, with the aid of the antipope, styled Leo VIII, whom he had set up himself, had a decree or canon passed, by which the emperor's right to interpose in the election of the Pope was recognized; and though the provisions of this law were annulled by Henry II, in the beginning of the following century, they were renewed again by Conrad II, and became the cause of incalculable evils to the Church. In consequence of this law there were three claimants to the papal chair at one time, and Henry III, the father of Henry IV, paid a visit to Rome, and succeeded in suppressing the schism, without, however, giv-

* Sermon. ii. † Ep. ii, et passim.
‡ Labbei. Concil. tom. ii, p. 30.
§ Id. Tom. viii. p. 1141.

* Ep. i, 11.

ing up the pretended privilege from which this and other evils had sprung.

It required such a man as Gregory VII to wrest from the hands of the German emperors what they would not willingly resign! And how wisely and how effectually he did it, Mr. Voigt informs us, and we shall have occasion to show more at length hereafter. Those writers who would fain persuade their readers that the controversy about investitures was one of mere form, show only their profound ignorance of history. It was a vital question—a question of liberty or slavery for the Church. And as long as kings and princes exercised this pretended right, can we wonder at the dreadful evils which St. Peter Damian so pathetically laments? Can we be astonished that this good man should weep, like another Jeremiah, over the calamities of God's people, and the desecration of his holy places—that, reposing near the sanctuary which he loved, he shed tears over its desolation and abandonment, while the courts of princes were thronged with a worldly minded clergy?* Can we wonder that when he had exhausted all the resources of prose, he resorted to poetry and wept in numbers over the evils of his day? And that finally disgusted with a world which he did not love, and which he despaired to be able to reform, he fled to solitude, and devoted himself entirely to prayer?

Mr. Voigt† ascribes Damian's retirement to a feeling of envy at Hildebrand's superiority. But there is little foundation for this assertion. The expressions of Damian, in which he calls Hildebrand‡ "*his holy adversary*," and§ "*his hostile friend*," and others of the same kind, only show some diversity of opinion and temperament between the two, but do not prove that there existed any jealousy. Hildebrand opposed his retiring, but Pope Alexander II permitted it on condition that Damian would come forth whenever the Church should need his services. Hildebrand was cool and deliberate, Damian was ardent and enthusiastic; but they both labored together for the same glorious object,—the extirpation of simony and incontinence among the clergy, and the stricter observance of the ancient canons. And that they were good friends may be gathered from a letter written by Damian from solitude,* in which, complaining that Hildebrand had not written to him oftener, he speaks of the manner in which he had ever co-operated with him: "in all his (Hildebrand's) struggles and victories, he (Damian) had thrown himself in, not as a mere fellow soldier or follower, but as a thunderbolt," an expression which shows the impetuosity of his zeal.

There is no doubt that the language of St. Peter Damian should be received with some allowance; but yet it is equally certain that the evils deplored by him were both widely spread and inveterate. How deeply seated was the malady may be gathered from the long and obstinate resistance of the clergy of Milan and Lombardy to the proposed Reformation—from the repeated tumults in Milan consequent upon the zealous efforts made by the holy deacon Arialdo, and by the pious chevaliers Landulph and Herlembaud to enforce the canons of the Church; from the tragical death of Arialdo, as graphically related by Mr. Voigt;† from the outrages which, in 1074, disgraced the synod of Erford, over which Sigefrid, archbishop of Mayence, presided, as legate of the Pope, and sought to extirpate abuses; from the elections of the two antipopes, Cadolous and Guibert, and the awful troubles brought upon Rome and the Church by their wicked ambition; and, in a word, from the whole life of Gregory VII, which was one continued struggle against vice and immorality seated in high places. All these scandals and troubles were the work of a faction, it is true, but of a strong and powerful faction, aided and urged on by some of the greatest princes of Europe, among whom Henry IV of Germany, and Philip I of France were the most conspicuous.

Such was the sad state of things in the Church, when Hildebrand was unanimously elected Pope by the clergy and people of

* Ep. i, 15. † Vol. i.
‡ "Sanctus satanas meus."
§ "Hostilis amicus meus."

* Ep. ii, 8. "Certaminibus et victoriis, ego me non commilitonem seu pedissequum, sed quasi fulmen injeci." † Vol. i, p. 153.

Rome in 1073. He was the very man that was best calculated to meet the emergency. He brought to the pontifical chair an experience of twenty-four years, during which he had been actively employed in various important affairs by previous pontiffs. From the pontificate of the holy Pope Leo IX (A. D. 1049), who had made him archdeacon of the Roman Church, to the day of his own election, he was the right arm of the Church's defence. So great was the confidence entertained in his judgment, that St. Peter Damian* says, that he himself followed his opinions as he would the canons of the Church. It was he who prompted Bruno, bishop of Toul, nominated Pope Leo IX by Henry IV, to take off the *insignia* of the papacy at the monastery of Cluny, to walk as a pilgrim to Rome, and not to accept of the tiara until he should be canonically elected by the clergy and people of that city. This was his first step towards the emancipation of the Church. He it was who advised, and perhaps penned the famous canon† of the Roman council held under Nicholas II in 1059, which fixed the mode of electing the sovereign pontiff, by the cardinals, with the consent of the people, and made the approval by the emperor a mere personal privilege to belong to those emperors ONLY, to whom it would be specially granted by the Pope.‡

Having brought to the pontificate so much wisdom, learned from experience, he employed it all in the government of the Church. He undertook nothing rashly. He was as cool and deliberate in taking his measures, as he was firm and persevering in carrying them out. All his efforts for the extinction of simony and incontinence among the clergy, and every stage of his struggle with Henry IV, of Germany, evidence his coolness and wisdom. He was consistent throughout. Every thing tended to the carrying out of his great plan—*to secure the freedom of the Church,* and *then to enforce its ancient canons.* He steadily pursued this plan for nearly thirty-six years.

* Ep. ii, 8. † Labb. Tom. ix, p. 1103.

‡ It is one evidence of the great genius and wisdom of Gregory VII, that the requirements of this canon are followed with but few modifications to this day, in the election of the Pope.

He was too clearly convinced of the soundness of his principles, and of the justice of his cause, ever to waver or falter in his course for one moment.

Yet he was not excessively stern, as many are inclined to believe. He had a tender and susceptible heart, sometimes filled "with an immensity of joy,"* and anon, "straitened with the most cruel grief."† His treatment of Henry IV, when he humbly sued for reconciliation with the Church at the castle of Canossa, is not an exception to his general character in this respect. He treated Henry with some rigor, because he had too much reason to doubt the sincerity of the young king's repentance, and the event furnished a sad proof of his forecast. Yet it must be borne in mind, that, though Henry immediately after broke all his solemn oaths, Gregory abstained for more than three years from renewing the excommunication, though repeatedly urged to do so. And when he did renew it, it was with the greatest reluctance. He was severe towards the obstinate, but at the first sign of repentance, his heart melted with sympathy. His kind treatment of Berengarius, who recanted in the synod of Rome in 1079, is a well known evidence of this. He even offered to pardon the wicked antipope Guibert of Ravenna, in case he would repent;‡ and he repeatedly offered to receive Henry himself again into the Church, after all his enormities, if he would but repent and repair the scandals he had given.§ He himself informs us that he was accused of too much leniency,‖ and Cardinal Hugh de Die, his legate in France, complained of the facility with which he absolved those ecclesiastics who had been excommunicated in French councils.¶

His activity was prodigious. By means of his legates he was every where, actively engaged by means of councils provincial

* Gaudii repleti immensitate, Ep. i, 40.

† Circumvallat me dolor immanis, Ep. ii, 49.

‡ Ep. v, 13.

§ Cardinal Arago gives us Gregory's reply to the Romans, when pressed by Henry's besieging army, they besought the pontiff to absolve him. Gregory offered to do it, but only on the conditions above named. Voigt, vol. ii, p. 416.

‖ Ep. i, 77. ¶ Voigt, vol. ii, p. 293.

and national, in reforming abuses, and restoring ecclesiastical discipline. His vast mind grasped the whole world, and yet entered every where into the most minute details! He has left nine books of letters written to every class of persons, from the prince on his throne, to the monk in his cell. His penetrating eye reached even Africa, where the few Christians that were left were trampled under foot by the Moors.* He was very solicitous about the reunion of the Greek, with the Latin Church. He was the first to conceive the project of a crusade, one great object of which was to aid the Christians of the east, and to heal the Greek schism. This conception alone would show how vast was his mind. He made two efforts to arouse Europe to a sense of its importance—but Europe was not yet prepared to throw herself on Asia. Hungary, Bohemia, Russia, Denmark and Spain were all sharers in his pastoral solicitude. He seemed to attend to each thing, as though he had nothing else to do; and even when beset by the greatest difficulties, he relaxed in nothing his ceaseless labors for the general good of the Church. He celebrated in Rome no less than eight councils, all of which were very numerously attended.

His letters exhibit perhaps the best portrait of his mind and heart. His style is similar to that of St. Gregory the Great, whom he greatly admired. Those who accuse him of worldly ambition have not read, or have not understood his letters. They all breathe higher motives, and a spirit not of this world. Mr. Voigt† has exhibited a condensed analysis of his principles and maxims from his letters, which evidences great industry, and a thorough acquaintance with his subject.

But the quality which most distinguished Gregory was his moral courage. No dangers appalled him—no obstacles nor difficulties deterred him from doing what was right. His soul grew with the events through which he had to pass. Who will not admire the calm composure which he evinced, when he was seized on Christmas-night at the very altar by an armed band of assassins led on by Cencius, when he was cruelly beaten; his hair plucked out, his pontifical robes torn off, and himself dragged off a prisoner to their leader's castle? Who will not admire the forbearance which requited this outrage, with so effectual an interposition, as screened its perpetrator from the effects of popular indignation? Who will not be struck by the noble courage manifested by him, in the last council he held in Rome, in 1083, when, beset on all sides with difficulties innumerable—with Henry's victorious troops threatening Rome, he arose in the council, and, with the face "*more of an angel than of a man,*"* spoke with an eloquence so stirring, as to move all who were present to tears! This noble courage was his great ruling feeling, strong even in death; and the memorable words, which were the last he uttered before he expired an exile at Salerno,† "*I have loved justice and hated iniquity, and therefore I die in exile,*" contribute much to give us an insight into his character.

II. Such were the qualities of Gregory—such the difficulties he had to contend with in fulfilling the duties growing out of his *spiritual* relations to the Church. He had to encounter obstacles yet more fearful in his *temporal* relations to civil society. He could not expect to carry out his favorite plan of reformation, without being thwarted at every step by the princes of the earth. Besides the pernicious influence of their example, their claims in regard to investiture were as we have seen, at war with the liberties, and subversive of the dearest interests of the Church. Gregory saw fully the difficulty of his position. He perceived the storm which was gathering, and was prepared to endure its most merciless peltings!‡ He quailed not, either in the anticipation, or, when the fearful reality more than justified his worst forebodings!

* Ep. i, 22, 23. See Voigt, vol. i, p. 35.
† Vol. i, pp. 261—8.

* See Labb. Concil tom. x, p. 402. "Ore magis angelico quam humano."
† Dilexi Justitiam, odi iniquitatem; ideo morior in exilio.—Paul Bernried c. 110.
‡ Speaking of Henry (Ep. i, 11), he uses this remarkable language: et certe tutius est defendendo veritatem pro sui ipsius salute adusque sanguinem nostrum sibi resistere, quam ad explendam ejus voluntatem iniquitati consentiendo secum quod absit ad interitum ruere.

The charges brought against him by his enemies may be reduced to these two heads: 1. He is accused of ambition, in seeking to make the kings of Hungary, Dalmatia, Sardinia, Spain, and England take the oath of fealty to the holy see: and he is charged with aiming at universal dominion in civil as well as in ecclesiastical matters. 2. He is greatly blamed for having attempted to depose Henry IV, emperor of Germany. We will endeavor to meet both these charges, and to prove that in his relations to princes, his influence was highly beneficial to civil society.

1. All the writers of the eleventh century paint Europe as being in a most distracted condition. England was passing through a revolution under William the Conqueror, and the south of Italy was also being revolutionized by Robert Guiscard; while Spain was struggling with the Moors, and Germany was torn by the most fierce civil wars between Henry IV, and the princes of the empire. France was not free from internal troubles, while its southern frontier was threatened by the Saracens; and in the east, Constantinople was tottering to its fall, and the rising dynasty of the Turks menaced with extermination the Christian name, in places where it had been once so illustrious. In civil society every thing was in a state of disorder; the laws were trampled under foot with impunity; and *might* and *right* were viewed as almost synonymous terms. The weak were oppressed by the strong; and the feudal system, which had just obtained a firm foothold in Europe, was bringing forth its bitter first fruits—of anarchy, petty civil wars, and bloodshed. St. Peter Damian* draws a graphic picture of the manner in which the feudal chieftains robbed one another, and then recklessly "set fire to the cottage of the poor laborer." And Gregory VII, in many of his epistles, weeps over the murders and confusion of his time, calling it appropriately "THE AGE OF IRON."

In this distracted condition of things, only one power was universally acknowledged and respected—that of the Church, and of its visible head, the sovereign pontiff. And we are not to be surprised at seeing princes often invoking this power whenever they got into difficulties with their subjects, or with one another. Nor was this always a mere mark of respect to the holy see—it was oftener a prudential measure for their own security. When, by taking the oath of fealty to the Pope, they became the feudal subjects of the holy see, they had a right to expect from it protection against foreign invasion of their kingdom or domestic usurpation of their throne. Thus, in return for a fealty, which included chiefly spiritual obedience to the Pope, with a very small annual offering to the papal treasury, they often received from the holy see the most substantial favors. Any one who recklessly invaded a state thus placed under the "protection of St. Peter," after having been admonished to desist, incurred, if he persisted, the sentence of excommunication.

Such being the case, we are not astonished that kings and princes in those troubled times often placed their crowns at the pontiff's feet. Thus Demetrius, king of Russia, sent his son all the way to Rome to implore* Pope Gregory VII, to receive his kingdom as a fief of the holy see: and Gregory in his answer,† seems to grant his request with some reluctance, and requires of him what was usually required in such cases, that he should promise to assist his liege sovereign, (the holy see) "*in all things just.*" Many kings in dying left their kingdoms under the protection of the Pope; and whenever a powerful baron or neighboring prince sought to violate this testamentary disposition, to the prejudice of the infant heir, the Pope interposed, as in the case of Vezelin, who attempted to usurp the throne of Dalmatia.‡ Thus also Henry III, left his infant son Henry IV, under the guardianship of his widow, the empress Agnes, and of Pope Victor II.

It is not necessary to multiply facts to prove that one great feature of medieval jurisprudence was the express or tacit acknowledgment of a kind of universal pro-

* Ep. i, 15, supra cit.

* "Devotis precibus." (Ep. ii, 74.) † Ibid.
‡ See St. Gregory, VII. Ep. vii, 4.

tectorate in the Roman pontiff. We find even the fierce Robert Guiscard bowing down and taking the oath of fealty to the holy see. It is proper however to observe here, once for all, that the oath of feudal vassalage did not imply unlimited obedience—much less did it enforce a slavish submission in all things to the will of the liege lord. Feudal allegiance was very different from that of modern times. The former was peculiar to the middle ages, and its duties were few and clearly marked, requiring at the same time as a condition *sine qua non*, the compliance with certain correlative duties on the part of him to whom the oath was taken.

Gregory could not hope to carry out his plan for reforming the Church, without the co-operation of temporal princes. From many of them he had reason to expect the most determined opposition. Hence it is not at all surprising, that, intent upon *one great idea*, he sought, from the very commencement of his pontificate, to rally around him the princes of the earth. This will explain to us his course of conduct in regard to Dalmatia, Hungary, Sardinia, and part of Spain, which, in various letters, he sought to prove, to have been in former times feudal dependencies of the holy see. We read of no resistance to his claims in any of these countries, which proves that they were well founded, and that the documents he alleged were genuine. This should put to shame those maligners of the sainted pontiff, who would fain persuade us, that he forged documents to suit his own purposes!! To prove, that the princes and people of the middle ages were not advocates of passive obedience, even to the Pope, particularly where temporal matters were concerned, we may adduce the refusal by William the Conqueror, to take the oath of fealty to Gregory. His answer to the pontiff is brief, blunt, and characteristic of the Norman: yet even *he*, while positively refusing to take the oath, says nothing in his answer to impugn the motives of Gregory.* He had been the early favorite of Gregory who had extolled him as a model of princes;* and on his refusal to take the oath, the pontiff in his letter to his English legate Humbert, only complains of the bluntness of the English monarch, and of his refusal to suffer the English bishops to visit Rome. This last fact will perhaps explain to us his motive for endeavoring to induce William to take the oath.

Those who would charge Gregory with motives of mere worldly ambition, have not learned the first elements of his character. Had worldly grandeur been his object, why did he not obtain it, as he certainly could have done? Why did he not doff his humble and coarse apparel, and clothe himself in the "soft garments of kings?" Why did he not keep up a splendid court, and live luxuriously in the midst of earthly pomp and display? Why did he not die a great temporal prince, instead of a poor exile at Salerno? Ambition, forsooth! Nothing was more foreign from his mind and heart. All his letters breathe a higher spirit—all his acts imply higher motives. He was not a man to swerve one iota from the plain path of duty, for all the kingdoms of the world! "*I would rather*," says he, "*undergo death for your salvation, than obtain the whole world, to your spiritual ruin. For I fear God, and therefore value but little the pride, and pleasures of the world.*"†

2. Much has been written of the pontiff's long and painful struggle with Henry IV of Germany: but those who have taken occasion from it to cast all the blame on Gregory, betray great ignorance of the history of that remarkable contest. In the first place, who was Henry, and what was his character? He was the most powerful sovereign of his day, and his vast empire extended over more than half of Europe. His influence was immense for good or for evil. He was in his twenty-third year, when Gregory was raised to the pontificate. His many natural good qualities had been almost destroyed by a vicious education from his earliest youth—the stream of his existence had been tainted in its very source. He had given into the most criminal excesses from the time he had first

* See his answer to the pontiff in Voigt, vol. ii, p. 330, note.

* See Voigt, vol. i, p. 425. † Ep. vi, 1.

mounted the throne, and from a confirmed *debauchee*, had become the most heartless and cruel of men. For his criminal excesses, and his shameful sale of bishopricks and abbeys, he had been already summoned to appear before the holy see, in the last year of Pope Alexander II.* This sumsoms had no other effect upon the dissolute young king, than to cause him to enter momentarily into himself: but on the death of Alexander, his excesses became more enormous and insufferable than ever. He no longer observed any bounds. His court resembled more the seraglio of the mussulman, than the residence of a Christian prince. Perhaps a greater monster never disgraced a throne. To obtain the objects of his criminal passion, he stopped at nothing—husbands, fathers, or lovers were removed by assassination! He knew how to refine on cruelty: he could smile on you one day, and have a dagger sent to your heart the next! In adversity, he was the meanest of sycophants, and the most crouching of slaves: look at him at the diet of Tribur,† when the Saxons were victorious, and the princes of the empire had abandoned him; look at him also at the castle of Canossa, when sueing for reconciliation with the Church. When flushed with victory, he was the most ferocious of tyrants—crushing and trampling in the dust those who had already submitted: witness the horrible manner in which he overran Saxony, Thuringia, and Suabia, as most graphically painted by Voigt. He was as perfidious, as he was cruel. He could be bound neither by treaties the most solemn, nor by oaths the most sacred. In one word, he was the Nero of the middle ages, and his cotemporaries gave him this title.‡ All these charges could be substantiated by facts almost innumerable from Mr. Voigt, were it deemed necessary.

Such was the monster with whom Gregory had to deal. He could not escape a contest with such a man, without sacrificing his most sacred duty. For, in addition to Henry's private and political crimes, he made a regular traffic of the bishopricks and abbeys, intruding into them the most unworthy subjects; thus deluging the Church with a flood of scandals! He would sell a bishoprick to one, and if another subsequently offered more, he would have the former deposed as simoniacal, and bestow the investiture upon the latter! By this abuse, some of the principal Churches had two, and that of Milan, had three bishops at one time!! Thus schisms were added to the other evils of the Church.

How did Gregory deport himself in his controversy with Henry? The limits of this article will not allow more than a very brief *expose* of the various stages of that contest; and those who may wish a fuller account of it, are referred to the luminous work of Mr. Voigt. We will endeavor to present in order the various facts of the case, scattered through the two volumes of our author; and we think, it will be seen, that the simple unadorned statement of facts is the best possible vindication of Gregory's course.

1. From the very commencement of his pontificate, he employed every means in his power to win the heart of Henry: he wrote to him two letters* full of sweetness, unction and a divine eloquence in which he appealed to him by every consideration that was calculated to touch his heart, and arouse him to a proper sense of his duty: in both of these letters he however hinted to him, that, in conformity with the jurisprudence of the age, the right to the crown could be secured to him, *only*, on condition "of his governing according to the law of God, and protecting the liberty of his holy Church." To his own efforts, his influence added those of Henry's mother, the pious Empress Agnes, and of the Countesses Beatrix and Matilda his (Henry's) relatives; not to mention those of the great and good Anno, archbishop of Cologne.

2. When Henry, notwithstanding the hopes with which his answer had at first inspired Gregory, still continued in his evil

* See Voigt, vol. i, p. 23. † Ibid, vol. ii, 168—9. ‡ St. Anselm. Tract. de Ferment.

* See them in Voigt, vol. i, 407—8. Mr. Voigt thinks that these letters are master pieces of prudence and eloquence. In general, all the epistles of Gregory breathe sentiments fresh from a heart, warmed by divine charity.

courses, the latter did not immediately excommunicate him. He proceeded slowly and cautiously. His object throughout seems to have been to correct, not to crush Henry. He first excommunicated the unworthy bishops who had purchased their sees from him; then five of his evil counsellors: hoping that he would profit by these unequivocal demonstrations. And whenever Henry made the least show of repentance, with what paternal tenderness did not the pontiff felicitate him!* About this time, (A. D. 1073), Henry wrote him a most submissive and hypocritical letter;† and though Gregory saw through the deceit, and knew well that Henry's difficult political position alone had prompted the letter, yet with what sweetness did he not answer this letter!

3. Nearly two years later, in 1075, occurred the infamous plot of Cencius, and the outrage upon Gregory's person, alluded to above. The pontiff had every reason to believe, that Henry and Guibert archbishop of Ravenna, were at the head of this plot; and yet he forbore! He does not even allude to it in any of his controversy with Henry!!

4. In the same year, 1075, the brave Saxons, after a noble struggle against tyranny, submitted to Henry on the faith of a solemn treaty at Gerstungen, in which he promised to protect their property, and the liberty and rights of their princes.‡ Henry violated his solemn oaths, and trampled the brave Saxons in the dust. Crushed, and bleeding, they appealed to the Pope for protection. The "holy see," says Mr. Voigt,§ "*was the only tribunal, which could set any limits to imperial despotism, as a second defender of humanity.*" He might have said, that it was the *first*, and, in many cases, the *only* defender of *humanity*, of human liberty and rights. In those times of anarchy and confusion, to whom could the oppressed cry, but to the common father of Christians? Could Gregory be indifferent to their cry for relief? Could he do otherwise than hear their appeal, listen to their complaints, and endeavor to redress their wrongs? Henry himself had also appealed to the holy see against the Saxons;* so that Gregory saw both parties appealing to him to settle their quarrel. By the fact, he was virtually chosen *arbitrator*. Who can then blame him for taking cognizance of the cause, and for deciding in it according to justice? Would not posterity have censured him, had he neglected the appeal, thus solemnly interposed? At the instance of Rodolph, duke of Suabia, and of other German princes, Gregory had been induced† nearly two years previously in 1073-4, to act as *mediator* between Henry and the rebellious Saxons. He had accepted the office, and had written a most eloquent letter‡ to many bishops and princes of Germany, imploring them by their influence to stop the effusion of blood, until the difficulties could be amicably adjusted. But amidst the din of arms, this voice had not been heard. About that same time, Henry had sent embassadors to Rome to complain of the Saxons:§ so that he may be said to have appealed twice to the holy see. Gregory therefore had a *right* to interfere in the political affairs of Germany, under each of two characters—that of *mediator*, and that of *arbitrator*. Why have his enemies *concealed* these facts?

5. And who were the Saxons, whose cause Gregory espoused? They were the oppressed: they were the advocates of *liberty!* The decision of Gregory against Henry, was a blow aimed at tyranny, and struck for the rights of the people! If ever a people deserved liberty, the Saxons deserved that boon. Instead of being the fierce savages that some historians would fain represent them, they were remarkable for their accurate perception of right and justice, and for their firm, yet moderate, advocacy of their liberties. At the famous convention of the Saxon people at Nockmeslove, in 1073, Otto of Nordheim had made a speech, which for solid reasoning, and moving eloquence, perhaps equals any effort of our own Patrick Henry!‖ Its

* See his Ep. iii, 3. † Voigt, vol. i, p. 281.
‡ Ibid, vol. ii, p. 78. § Vol. ii, p. 98.

* Voigt, ii, p. 97. † Ib. vol. i, p. 360. ‡ Ep. i, 39.
§ Voigt, vol. i, p. 381. Where he cites for his authority, his favorite historian Lambert.
‖ Whoever will read the portion of this famous speech, given us by Mr. Voigt, (vol. i, p. 288-9, &c.) will scarcely think this an exaggeration. If

stirring accents rang throughout all Saxony, and its effect was not only to thrill every bosom, but to cause the war cry *"to arms! to arms!"* to be heard from every valley and hill-top! To show in what light the oath of fealty to the king was viewed in those days, we will present the following extract from Otto's speech: *"Perhaps you hesitate to break the oath you have taken to the king, because you are Christians! What! to the king! So long as he was king for me—so long as he showed himself such, I have scrupulously observed the oath I had taken: since he has ceased to act like a king, and to discharge the duties of a king, I owe him fealty no longer. Courage then! we do not march against the king. No,—but against the enemy of our liberty; against the enemy of our country, &c."*

This reasoning only alleges a principle generally received in the middle ages: that *obedience* and *protection* are correlative terms, and that the former ceases to be obligatory, where the latter is wanting.* According to this principle, Henry could have been deposed without the sanction of the Pope: and in fact the princes of the empire seriously thought of doing so before Gregory had spoken. The Saxons, in appealing to the Pope had not only expressly recognized in him the power of deposing princes, but had said, that the German empire was a fief of the holy see.† In fine, Gregory, while declaring *under all the circumstances*, that the Saxons were absolved from their oath of allegiance to Henry, did precisely what every American and every lover of liberty would have done.

6. In answer to the appeal of the Saxons, Gregory wrote a letter to Henry, in which, after having employed all his eloquence to reclaim him, he threatened him with excommunication, unless he repented and reformed.* Flushed with his recent victory over the Saxons, Henry despised the admonitions of the pontiff. He assembled a conventicle at Worms, in 1075, which attempted to depose Gregory, and set up Guibert, archbishop of Ravenna, in his stead.† He directed two insolent letters to the Roman people and to the Pope, to announce to them the decision of the mock council: and sent Rolando, a secret emissary, to insult the pontiff to his face, in the council which he was to open in Rome. Gregory screened the envoy from the punishment which his insolence provoked; read the insulting documents himself to the council, with the utmost *sang froid;* and, in order to let the excitement subside, adjourned the session until the next day. He then calmly explained to the one hundred and ten assembled bishops, the whole of his past relations with Henry, and his wish to secure the freedom and peace of the Church. It was only at the most urgent request of the council, that he consented to excommunicate Henry.‡

7. It is manifest, that in the whole proceeding Gregory wished to correct and not to degrade Henry: hence, in a letter to the princes and bishops of Germany, he promised to readmit him on repentance.§

8. It was a law of the German empire, that if a prince remained under excommunication for one year, he forfeited his crown.‖ Hence it was that Henry was in so much haste to be absolved by Gregory at Canossa.

9. If Gregory deposed Henry, the consent of princes and people at that time secured to him the right to do so. This is so certain, that it is not deemed necessary to adduce facts to prove it. Voigt admits it;¶ and his translator proves it by incontestible cotemporary documents.** Gregory then usurped nothing—he is borne out by the spirit and the jurisprudence of his age.††

some one would take the trouble to collect together the various famous speeches of the middle ages, and present them in a good English dress, he would add to the stock of medieval literature. This speech, two or three of Gregory before Roman councils and one of Urban II, at the council of Clermont in 1095, might belong to the collection.

* See decision of a council of Toledo referred to by Guizot—Lectures, &c. where this principle is connected with the etymology of the word *rex recte*, &c.

† See Voigt, vol. ii, p. 98.

* See Voigt, vol. ii, p. 103.
† Ibid, p. 107.
‡ Ibid, p. 115, et seq.
§ Ibid, p. 129.
‖ Ibid, p. 137.
¶ Ibid, p. 214.
** See his introduction, p. lix. et seq.

†† See a work by Gosselin, published in Paris, 1829, entitled, Pouvoir des Papes sur les souverains, au Moyen Age. See also the admirable work of Count de Maistre, "Du Pape." Voltaire also admits this.

10. Finally, though Henry was not sincere in obtaining absolution from the excommunication, at Canossa; though in less than fifteen days thereafter he broke all his solemn oaths, yet Gregory abstained for nearly four years from renewing the excommunication. His legates in Germany went beyond their instructions, when, at the diet of Forcheim in 1077, they approved of the election of Rodolph. He often lamented this imprudent step.* He viewed it as premature, and calculated to foment, rather than to remedy the troubles of Germany and of the Church; and he declares,† that "*he would rather suffer death, if necessary, than be the cause of the troubles of the Church.*" He labored incessantly to heal the divisions of Germany, and to stop the effusion of blood—council after council, he assembled in Rome—diet after diet, he appointed to be held in Germany, for the final settlement of the matter. But Henry thwarted all his measures: so far from seeking, he was afraid of that justice which Gregory wished to have meted out to him. *He* then, and not Gregory, was responsible for the protracted civil war in Germany.

Such was Gregory, as shown by his acts. Henry triumphed over him for a time; and he died an exile; but he died as he had lived, virtuous, calm, unshaken and happy. Henry died, reduced to the lowest degradation, abandoned by all, and despised by all, even his own sons, who had successfully carried on a civil war against him. Gregory was "the Hercules of the middle ages: he enchained monsters, crushed the hydra of feudalism, saved Europe from barbarism, and what is more beautiful still, he illustrated Christian society by his virtues.‡ We conclude with the last words of Mr. Voigt: "It is difficult to bestow on him exaggerated eulogy: for he has laid every where the foundation of a solid glory. But every one should wish to render justice to whom justice is due; let no one cast a stone at him that is innocent: let every one respect and honor a man, who has labored for his age, with views so grand and so generous. Let him who is conscious of having calumniated him, re-enter into his own conscience." P. F.

* This fact does not appear to be generally known. Even Feller (Dict. Hist. Art. Greg. VII) ascribes the election of Rodolph to Gregory: and this too in the face of many of the pontiff's letters, and of his solemn declaration to the contrary, at the Roman council held in 1080! He also asserts that, Gregory excommunicated Henry again immediately after their reconciliation at Canossa in 1076: whereas, though his legates in Germany renewed the excommunication in 1077, yet the pontiff himself abstained from doing so until 1080.

† Ep. iv, 24.

‡ Abbe Jager Introd. p. xcix.

FENELON.—ANECDOTES OF HIS LIFE AND WRITINGS.

BY W. J. WALTER.

Concluded from page 73.

DAY by day the writings of Fenelon began to excite the attention of the public. Whatever opinion might have been previously entertained of his talents, and acquirements, no one had anticipated, or indeed could anticipate, that, in a theological controversy, he would have dared to enter the field with so formidable an antagonist as the author of the "Variations," and the "Conference with Claude." For half a century Bossuet had occupied the field; the other prelates were lost in the blaze of his splendor. Add to this that Fenelon stood before the public invested with that kind of renown which persecution and misfortune always give to genius and to virtue. Hitherto Bossuet had been the accuser. Often, indeed, he assumed the tone and authority of a judge. He thought he had reduced Fenelon to the painful and humiliating dilemma, either of remaining silent, or being the mere repeller of accusations. But Fenelon in the last letter, of which we selected a part, had elevated himself without any vio-

lation of the courtesies of life, to a rank which became a bishop; conscious of the purity of his motives and the sincerity of his faith, and of the right which he possessed of defending his opinions against the attack of his brother prelates, by an appeal to the tribunal of their common superior. He had thus taken a stand, not in the rank of the accused, but of the accuser; and Bossuet felt that he must collect all his energies to resist an opponent whose resources and whose genius he had not duly appreciated.

But Fenelon had more powerful enemies than even Bossuet arrayed against him. His firmness exasperated Louis XIV, and those by whom he was governed. Fenelon still retained the title of preceptor to the royal dukes. With a littleness of revenge, the king ordered a list of the officers about their persons to be presented to him, and with his own hand he drew a line over the name of Fenelon. Under this and other indignities, he preserved the pious serenity of his mind. "Yet but a little while," he said to a friend, "and the deceitful dream of life will be over. We shall meet in the kingdom of truth, where there is no error, no division, no scandal; we shall *breathe* the pure love of God, not *dispute* about it, and taste of that peace which passeth all understanding. In the meantime let us suffer, let us suffer; let us be trodden under foot; let us not refuse disgrace. Our Divine Model did not refuse it; it is the best means of disciplining our hearts here, and will tend to our glory hereafter."

In the meantime his enemies did not desist from their efforts, and the worst remains yet to be told. Seeing the vantage ground which Fenelon had taken up, and the sympathies he had enlisted in his favor, other and darker means were sought for to overwhelm him. It is not without pain that we record the fact. Long ago surmises had been heard prejudicial to the morals of Madame de Guyon, and a Father Lacomb, frequently the companion of her wanderings, and the promulgator of her doctrines. Like that lady he had for a long time been a prisoner for his opinions. He was a man of a heated imagination; and, like many other victims of illusion, long imprisonment and the leisure to brood over his monomania, had weakened his intellects. He had addressed a letter to the bishop of Tarbes, containing strong expressions of self-condemnation. The letter fell into the hands of Fenelon's enemies; they fancied they saw in it an avowal of the most scandalous excesses, and made use of it as a victorious means of convicting Madame de Guyon, and of tainting by implication the pure and unsullied reputation of the good Fenelon. So much importance was attached to the letter that the cardinal archbishop of Paris took it to Madame de Guyon, and pressed her in the most solemn and moving terms to confess every thing. She heard him with amazement,—exclaiming that Father Lacomb must have been deranged to write such a letter. The accusation, however, was not only believed, but a copy of it was forwarded to Rome.

When Pope Innocent XII heard of these proceedings, he wept like a child, and was heard to say, "and is it upon grounds like these that my son Louis of France has put out of doors the relations and friends of such a man as Fenelon!" By the way this was the fact. When the letter was read to the king he ordered all the friends and adherents of Fenelon to quit the court. But in spite of these odious measures, the public favor and every honorable sympathy began to manifest themselves for Fenelon. It was felt that the existence of virtue itself would be problematical, should it be proved that Fenelon was not virtuous. At this critical moment Bossuet struck the blow which all the world has deplored; he gave to the public his book entitled "A Relation of Quietism."

The friends of Fenelon were anxious that he should oppose nothing to this angry pamphlet but the integrity of his life and the reputation of his virtue. But he thought differently. The manner in which it might prejudice his cause, rendered a full refutation necessary. It was done with all that frankness and despatch which injured innocence alone could employ. Bossuet's Relation appeared in the middle of June; Fenelon's reply was published on the third of August. A nobler effusion of the indigna-

tion of insulted genius and virtue, eloquence has never produced. In the first lines of it, Fenelon placed himself immeasurably above his antagonist, and to the last he preserves his elevation. "Notwithstanding my innocence," says he, "I was always apprehensive of a dispute of facts: I knew that such a dispute between bishops must occasion considerable scandal. . . . . What an indecency to behold in the house of God; in his very sanctuary, his principal ministers venting their angry feelings in declamations one against the other. Your age and my infirmities must soon bring us before him, whom credit cannot influence, eloquence cannot sway. *You* to profess to be afraid of *my* power, to fear *my* subtilty! To what shifts are you reduced! *You* under a necessity of proving seriously that I have more power than *you!* . . . . Believe me, sir, we have been too long a spectacle to the world; an object of derision to the ungodly, of compassion to the good. That other men should be but men is not surprising; but that the ministers of Christ, the angels of the Church, as inspired language has called them, should exhibit such scenes to the scoffer and the unbeliever, calls for tears of blood. If, instead of consuming our time in interminable disputes, we had been in our diocesses, teaching Christ's little ones their simple catechism, and instructing the poor villager to love his neighbor and fear his God, how much more profitably should we have been employed!"

After Fenelon's triumphant vindication there were still disbelievers. Bossuet's solemn denunciation that "the time was come when terrible secrets should be revealed," continued to influence many. And sure enough, the terrible revelation took place shortly after. Father Lacomb had been dragged all the way from the south of France to be confronted with the partner of his guilt. When an attempt was made to question him it was found that his intellects were wholly deranged. He was placed in a private madhouse, and died some months after in a state of complete insanity; while the most satisfactory testimonials were produced of Madame de Guyon's pious and exemplary conduct in the convent to which she had retired. And so ended this miserable contrivance; so triumphant to Fenelon, so disgraceful to his adversaries.

After much intrigue, Fenelon's enemies at last succeeded in Rome. For a long time, the holy father sought to avoid a final decision. To his praise be it said, that, in spite of insinuations, not unmingled with menaces, he held the balance steadily, and after every effort of the king of France and his partisans to make it kick the beam, it trembled at last with only a slight preponderance against Fenelon. Twenty-three propositions, reducible to two, were condemned, but so gentle was the condemnation that Fenelon's name never once occurs in the brief. These circumstances soothed the sorrow of Fenelon's friends, and not a little mortified his enemies. Pope Innocent said a good thing which was in every mouth: "Fenelon has erred through an excess of the love of God; Bossuet has sinned through a want of love for his neighbor." A wag hearing that this bon mot was badly relished at court, observed, "Why take offence? after all 'twas but an *innocent* joke." The queen of Poland's antithesis is also well known: "Bossuet makes us fear error; Fenelon makes us love the truth." The following well turned epigram went the round of the journals of the day.

Dans ces fameux debats, ou deux prêlats de France
Semblent chercher la *Vérité*,
L'un dit qu'on detruit l'*Esperance*,
L'autre, que c'est la *Charité*:
C'est la *Foi* qui perit, et personne n'y pense.

For want of a better take the following translation:

"Why do those prelates wrangle so?"
Tis in the cause of *Truth*, you know;
One says that *Hope* 's destroyed, and one
That blessed *Charity* 's undone,—
"But what of *Faith*?" Though in the stir
She suffers most, none think of her.

The first intimation of the arrival of the Pope's brief was given to Fenelon by his brother, at the moment he was about to ascend the pulpit of his cathedral to preach; and the news of it was immediately circulated throughout the congregation. Fenelon recollected himself; he paused for a moment or two, and then, changing the plan

of his sermon, preached on the duty of obedience to the Church. The interest of the moment, the subject of his discourse, the sentiments it expressed, the religious calm with which it was delivered, the solemn engagement he contracted by it to practise on that trying occasion the submission which he preached—all, drew tears of sorrow, of respect, of admiration from the whole audience.

Without losing a moment, Fenelon published a pastoral letter, addressed to all the faithful of his district. It was simple, as sincerity always is. "Our holy father," he says, "has condemned my book, entitled the 'Maxims of the Saints,' and has condemned, in a particular manner, twenty-three propositions extracted from it. We adhere to his brief, and condemn the book, and the twenty-three propositions, simply, absolutely, and without a shadow of reserve." How touching this example, how beautiful this renunciation of self, what a lesson to the pride of our nature!

He sent his pastoral letter to Pope Innocent, solemnly assuring his holiness, that he would never attempt to elude his sentence, or raise any questions in its regard. "Thus," to use the language of the good Chancellor D'Aguesseau, "the Archbishop of Cambray, who had fought like a lion in defence of his work while there was a chance of victory, submitted in an instant, like the lowliest lamb of his fold." As to Pope Innocent, his conduct throughout the whole of this painful business, is worthy of all praise. He generously wept over the virtue, the piety, and the talents, an error of which he was forced to condemn,

"Tho' e'en the error leaned to virtue's side."

When he read Fenelon's letter, he was touched with the unresisting spirit which it breathed, and observed to the cardinals round him: "The chair of Peter would be an easy seat, if he who fills it were consoled in all his difficulties by an obedience such as that of the archbishop of Cambray." On occasion of registering the brief, the Chancellor D'Aguesseau pronounced a discourse which the historian Henault characterizes as an immortal monument of the solidity of the Church of France, and an eternal honor to the chancellor. D'Aguesseau says: no discordant voice troubled the holy concert, the happy harmony of the oracles of the Church. What was the joy of the Church, when she found that he among the prelates from whose opposition she would have had most to fear, if his heart had been an accomplice of his understanding, had, more docile than the lowliest of his flock, anticipating the judgment of the prelates, and by pronouncing a painful but salutary sentence on himself, hastened to console the Church, whose alarms he had awakened—by professing readily and solemnly, a submission without reserve, an acquiescence without a shadow of restriction. How perfect Fenelon's sincerity was appears in a thousand instances. When certain influential persons promised to exert their influence at Rome in his behalf, and were showing him certain weak points of which he might take advantage against his enemies, he interrupted them by a simple and affecting expression: "My good friends, I have heard too much of this; say no more about it: *let me die in my simplicity!*" This touching phrase should be treasured in our remembrance. How often do we waste our labor in obtaining knowledge dangerous to our peace of heart; how often had it been better for us to exclaim with Fenelon: Let us die in our simplicity! A little circumstance will show his sincerity. He caused a remonstrance to be made for his private chapel for the exposition of the blessed sacrament. It was supported by two figures of angels, one of whom was represented as trampling under foot different works condemned by the Church, on one of them was seen the title of his own book. The famous Abbé de Rancé had written several harsh letters to Bossuet on Fenelon's book, and unfortunately those were made public. Fenelon could not reply to confidential letters, not addressed to him; but he availed himself of an opportunity that offered, to make the only reply that became his character and that of the Abbé de Rancé. He sent him a copy of his pastoral letter, accompanied by the following delicate and admirably written letter.

"Revered Father,—I take the liberty of sending you a pastoral letter which I have issued respecting my book. This explanation seemed to me to be necessary, as soon as I perceived, from your letters which were made public, that so enlightened and experienced a man as yourself, had conceived me in a manner very different from my meaning. I am not surprised that you believed what was said to you against me, both with regard to the past and the present. I am not known to you, and there is nothing in me which can render it difficult to believe the evil which is reported of me. You have confided in the opinion of a prelate whose acquirements are very vast. It is true, revered father, that if you had done me the honor to write to me respecting any thing which might have displeased you in my book, I should have endeavored either to remove your displeasure, or to correct myself. In case you should be thus kind, after having read the accompanying pastoral letter, I shall still be ready to profit by your knowledge, and testify all due deference to your opinion. Nothing has occurred to alter in me those sentiments which are due to you, and to the work which God has performed through you. Besides, I am sure you will not be hostile to the doctrine of disinterested love, when that which is equivocal in it shall be removed, and when you are convinced how much I should abhor to weaken the necessity of hoping and desiring our beatitude in God. On this subject I wish for nothing more than what St. Bernard has taught, with so much sublimity, and which you know better than I do. He left this doctrine to his children as their most precious inheritance. If it were lost and forgotten in the whole world beside, we should still find it at La Trappe, in the heart of your pious ascetics. It is this love which confers their real value upon the holy austerities practised there. This pure love, which leaves nothing to nature, but refers all things to grace, cannot encourage illusion, for that always springs from the natural and excessive love of ourselves. It is not in yielding to this pure love, but in not following it sufficiently, that we are misled. I cannot conclude this letter without soliciting of you the aid of your prayers, and of those of your community: I have need of them. You love the Church; God is my witness, that I wish to live but for her, and that I should abhor myself, if I could account myself as any thing when her honor is at stake. I shall ever be, with sincere veneration, your affectionate brother in Christ, Fenelon."

After this he wisely declined all writing and discourse relative to his book, and, at an early moment wholly dismissed the controversy from his thoughts. Several years after, in conferring with the chevalier Ramsay, a Scotch gentleman of good family, who, under Fenelon's instructions became a convert to the Church, he thus calmly reverted to the subject: "Do not think that the Church condemned the pure love of God in condemning my book: it is one of the most sacred of her doctrines. But the expressions which I employed in explaining it, were not proper for a doctrinal work. My book is worth nothing; it was but the abortion of my mind. I do not wish you to read it."

After the storms to which he had been exposed, Fenelon's only thought was the welfare of the flock entrusted to his care, and his only wish to close a peaceful and honorable life in the midst of the friends who loved him, and of a people who adored him.

He was an admirer of the simple beauties of nature, and his only recreation was a solitary ramble among the fields, at a short distance from Cambray. In the course of his walks, he would often join the peasants, sit down with them on the grass, talk with them, and console them in their little difficulties and distresses. He visited them in their cottages, would seat himself at table with them, and partake of their humble meals. He was all charity, all indulgence. When one of his curés said to him gravely, "Monseignor, I can't prevent these people from dancing on a Sunday: they will dance." "My good Abbé," said Fenelon in his quiet manner, "neither you nor I have any need to dance; but let these poor people dance; their hours of happiness are not *too* numerous, why prevent them from forget-

ting for a moment or two the sorrows of life? Let them dance, let them dance." We are willing to believe that none of our readers will think less of Fenelon for this amiable and indulgent trait in his character. In a letter to a friend, he says: "I deal gently with my flock; I endeavor to make them familiar with me; I would a thousand times sooner err on that side, than in what is called keeping up the dignity of one's character. They appear to have confidence in me, and by that way I shall be sure to make my way to their hearts. With all their bonhommie, and under their homely outside, these Flemmanders are shrewd fellows. They enquire of one another whether I am really banished; and they question my servants about it. One or two of them, after a good deal of address in making their approach to the question, asked me if it was so, and I made no mystery of the matter to them. It is an affliction to be separated from you and my other friends, but as to the court, I am happy to be at a distance from it. With all my heart do I sing the canticle of deliverance."

One or two other traits will better serve to illustrate Fenelon's character, than all the dissertations in the world about it. In the midst of his vexations on the subject of Quietism, a fire burned to the ground the archiepiscopal palace at Cambray, and consumed all his books and manuscripts. He bore the misfortune not only with resignation but with cheerfulness. One of his friends hastening to inform him of the accident, found him cheerfully engaged in conversation, so much at his ease, indeed, that he felt sure Fenelon knew nothing of the calamity, and began with some preparation to break the thing to him. "Oh," said Fenelon, "I know all about it. I am sorry for the books and papers, but it was better that palace should be burned to the ground than the cottage of any one of my poor parishioners." Talk of your stoics! this is the true kind of philosophy.

During the fierce and bloody contest for the Spanish succession, the diocess of Cambray was often the theatre of war, and experienced the cruel ravages of advancing and retreating armies. But an extraordinary respect was paid to Fenelon by the invaders of France. The Germans, the Dutch, and my own countrymen, rivalled the inhabitants of Cambray in their veneration for the good archbishop. All distinctions of religion and sect, all feelings of national hatred and jealousy, disappeared in the presence of Fenelon. And after the anecdotes we have heard, where the wonder?

"One touch of nature makes the whole world kin."

The corn on his estate was saved and brought in for him, and his fields and orchards were exempted from the general ravage. Military escorts were offered him for his personal security; indeed, he was often obliged to have recourse to artifice to avoid the honors which the armies of the enemy intended him. The military escorts he declined, and trusting to the protection of the Almighty, and attended only by a few ecclesiastics, he traversed the countries desolated by war, to visit, instruct, console, and shield his flock. His way was marked by his alms and benefactions, by the blessings of his parishioners, and by a suspension of the calamities which war brings in its train. In these intervals, the people breathed in peace, and an eloquent writer beautifully terms his pastoral visits "the truce of God." He brought together into his palace, the wretched whom alarm had driven from their home; his cares to them were those of a parent to his children, and he fed them at his own table. In one of the visits we have described, he met one of his poor parishioners, plunged in the deepest affliction. "What's the matter with you, my friend?" inquired Fenelon. "Alas! my lord bishop," said the poor man, "in making my escape from my cottage, I had not time to bring off my cow. Poor creature, she was the support of my children, and, next after your lordship, was the best friend of the family. The enemy will drive her off, and I shall never find another so good." Fenelon attempted to comfort him, offering him money to buy another; but nothing could console him; he had lost *his* cow, and his tears continued to fall. Pursuing his journey, Fenelon found the very cow which

was the object of so much affliction. Night was setting in, but before it was dark he had himself driven it before him to the peasant's new habitation. Should any one sneer at an archbishop's driving home a cow, as O'Malley would say: "Troth, and he's guilty of something worse than an Irish bull!" Speaking of this little anecdote, the Cardinal Maury says: "I have always looked upon this as the finest trait in Fenelon's life. Wo to those who listen to it, without being affected!" It was by a character like this that Fenelon won the hearts of his flock, and the heart once gained, the duty of the pastor becomes light. Long after his death, the old people who had the happiness to see him, spoke of him with the most tender reverence. "There," they would say, pointing to a chair carefully preserved in one corner of their cottage, "there is the chair on which our good archbishop used to sit in the midst of us: we shall never see such another"—and then their tears would flow.

You will all wonder how such a man could be pursued by the unrelenting hatred of Louis XIV, and I think I hear you whisper, that it certainly was not one of the things that made him Louis le grand. Not only was the court closed against him and his relations, but it was part of the etiquette of the day never to pronounce Fenelon's name at Versailles. It is, however, pleasing to know, that the duke of Burgundy's attachment to him was never weakened. The preceptor and pupil frequently corresponded. When the duke took the command of the army in Flanders, he was compelled to ask leave of Louis to visit Fenelon in his way through Cambray; it could only be done in the presence of certain persons who were named. The atmosphere about Fenelon must, forsooth, have been mighty dangerous! In an affectionate letter, the duke had apprised Fenelon of this permission. When the courier arrived at Cambray with the letter, Fenelon, with that delicacy which was natural to him, had absented himself from the town, not to put himself unasked in the duke's way. They met, however, at a public dinner, but a meeting in the presence of spies, wanted the grace of unrestraint. Once or twice Fenelon said something to enliven the conversation; but all would not do. According to etiquette, he presented the duke, at the end of dinner, with a napkin to wipe his hands. The pupil availed himself of this moment to unbosom his heart to his old preceptor; then, raising his voice loud enough to be heard by all present, he said to him: "I am sensible, my lord archbishop, of what I owe to you, and you know what and who I am." They never met again. When Fenelon's uncle lay on his death bed in Paris a lady ventured to breathe Fenelon's name in the royal ear and to entreat permission for him to pay the last duty of humanity to his relative. This lady was the Marquess de Bouvilliers, and her request was coldly refused. It is known that the king's resentment was confirmed by the publication of "Telemachus," in the moral strictures of which charming work, the royal eye was keen enough to see what no other mortal vision could detect, a bitter satire against himself and his favorites. The book lives, in spite of royal censure and royal suppression, to instruct our own and all future generations, innocent of any satire contained in its pages:—

"Suspicion ever haunts the guilty mind."

In his retirement at Cambray, during the intervals between his pastoral duties, Fenelon found leisure for writing, and for philosophical disquisition, as witness, among other works of the kind, his "Treatise on the Existence of God," written to satisfy the doubts of the future regent of France, the Duke d'Orleans, who refused to bend his reason to religion, and yet was a firm believer in astrology; whence the hit of our poet Pope:

"The godless regent trembling at a star."

Fenelon was a passionate admirer of Virgil, and we learn that he translated the Æneid, though unfortunately the manuscript is lost; perhaps it perished in the fire of which we have spoken. Fenelon was also mingled up in the fierce disputes relative to Jansenism, and was severely handled by writers on both sides. Of the

errors revived by the Jansenists, Molina was the originator, as Molinos was of the reveries of Quietism, so that Fenelon suffered from both. The whimsical coincidence in these names, Molinos and Molina, did not escape the wags of that day; one of them turns the thing in a way which it is not very easy to translate, but which is something like the following:

> He who Sylla's rocks would shun,
> In Charybdis' jaws may run;
> But who suffers shipwreck, who,
> On Sylla and Charybdis too?
> Vast is the gulph, as some suppose,
> 'Twixt Molina and Molinos,
> Yet Fenelon got wrecked, oh la!
> On Molinos *and* Molina.

Among other works of Fenelon, are his Sermons, which, if not of so high an order as those of his great contemporaries, Bourdaloue and Massillon, have the merit of being practical, plain, and full of unction. Fenelon preached to instruct the ignorant, not to gratify the amateur; and his discourses are always intelligible to the commonest intellect. They could not address to him the compliment paid by a good woman to a pompous preacher: "I admire you very much, sir, but I should admire you still more if I could understand you."

A circumstance has been omitted in its proper place, which came to light only by the publication of the Fenelon papers, and which you will listen to with peculiar interest. It has been mentioned that the first aspirations of Fenelon on his entrance into holy orders, was to join the missions in the Levant. This is not correct. America was the first field for his missionary labors, and it was nothing but the delicate state of the young ecclesiastic's health which prevented this side of the Atlantic from sharing something of the celebrity of this illustrious name.

On the 7th of January, 1715, the world was deprived of one of its brightest ornaments; Fenelon was called away to receive the reward of his labors. The good man never dies: when we read his writings we are conscious of his immortality,—he is with us,—his spirit is among us, to instruct and to edify till time shall be no more. The last words of remarkable men are carefully treasured up. They are as the last brightening up of the expiring taper of life, and are preserved to image to the last the tone, character and history of the individual. Viewed in this light the parting words of Fenelon are remarkable. As he sunk back upon his pillow, his lips softly breathed those words of his Redeemer: "Not *my* will, but thine be done."

Such a man could not die in enmity with any human being. On his death bed he dictated a letter to his early patron and friend, Louis XIV, addressed to the king's confessor, Pere Lachaise. We give it, as well as his last will and testament, as they are the most perfect commentary upon the last words of Fenelon. There is a sacredness in sentiments breathed forth at a moment when no human consideration has any influence over them. His words to the king are these: "I have just received extreme unction. I am preparing to appear before my God, and I entreat you forthwith to represent to the king what are my real sentiments. I have ever felt the greatest docility towards the Church, and the greatest abhorrence of the innovations imputed to me. I received the condemnation of my book with the most absolute sincerity. There has never been a single moment of my life, in which I have not felt towards the king, the most profound respect and the most inviolable attachment. I take the liberty of soliciting from his majesty two favors, neither of which concerns either myself or any belonging to me. The first is that he will have the goodness to appoint a fit successor to feed the flock which is dear to my heart. The other is that he will aid my successor to finish what I had begun for the seminary of St. Sulpice. I am already indebted to his majesty for resources to found an institution, than which nothing can be more useful, venerable, and apostolical. I pray that his majesty may enjoy length of days, for the good, both of the Church and state. If I am to go and behold my God, I will frequently implore that blessing."

Fenelon's will runs as follows: "I declare that I die in the arms of the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church my mother. God, who reads the human heart, and who

is to be my judge, knows that in every moment of my life, I have felt for her the submission and the docility of a little child. When I wrote the 'Maxims of the Saints,' I had no other intention than to separate what the saints have truly and really experienced from the illusions of the false mystics, and thus to justify the one and reject the other. I produced the work in conformity to the advice of persons most opposite to any species of illusion, nor did I print it, till they had examined it. I endeavored to justify and vindicate this little book so long as I was at liberty so to do. As soon as Pope Innocent XII condemned the work, I sincerely adhered to that condemnation, without any reservation whatever; as, before receiving the act of the holy see, I had promised to do. From the moment it was condemned, I never said a single word in its justification. As to those who attacked it, my only thought was to pray for them in all sincerity of heart, and to live with them in the union of fraternal charity. To the Church universal, and to the apostolic see I submit all my writings, and I condemn in them whatever she condemns.

"Though I tenderly love my family, nor am unmindful of the bad state of their affairs; yet I cannot think myself at liberty to bequeath what I possess here. The goods of the Church are not intended for the wants of a family, and it ought only to pass into the hands of the Church.

"It is my wish to be buried in the metropolitan church of Cambray, in the most simple manner, and at the least possible expense. I do not express this merely from form, or from any affectation of modesty. It is from a persuasion that the money expended on costly funerals may be better employed in works of mercy; and that the plain simplicity of a bishop's interment may instruct the laity to moderate the sums vainly lavished upon theirs." Thus we see that Fenelon would not only die in his simplicity, but would also be buried in his simplicity.

Eighty years had scarcely elapsed from the death of Fenelon when the ruffians of the revolution, with fell and desperate purpose, made a pile of ruins of the ancient and venerable temple in which the good archbishop had celebrated the mysteries of religion; overthrew the altar before which he had so often breathed his prayers for the welfare of France, and hurled to the dust the pulpit from which that voice had so often sent forth benedictions. The repose of the dead was violated, and the ashes of kings, who slept beneath the roofs of antiquity, and of prelates who reposed beneath the shadow of the sanctuary, were scattered to the winds of heaven..

In 1819, the author of this article accompanied two young English noblemen in an excursion through the north of France. In our way through Cambray, we delivered a letter of introduction from the well known M. de Chateaubriand, to the lady superior of the sisters of charity in that city. After a courteous reception by the lady (a member, I believe, of the noble house of Montmorency), we were conducted into a small but neat chapel. At the foot of the altar was a catafalque, at each corner of which a taper was burning. The good sister who accompanied us, uncovered part of a plain velvet pall, and displayed beneath it a simple coffin of polished wood. That coffin contained all that was mortal of the good Fenelon. It had been rescued by the pious care, perhaps by the intrepidity, of those who loved and venerated him, and had been concealed till the fury of the tempest had swept by. The day of its restoration was celebrated with transports of joy by the good Flemmings, the children of those, who had enjoyed the enviable privilege of listening to his instructions and profiting by his example. While we were intently gazing upon the coffin, the good sister knelt in prayer at the foot of the altar. Myself, and my two travelling companions, Protestants though they were, followed her example. Fenelon is not in the list of the canonized; but who will say that he is not worthy to take his rank there? In our excursion, we had seen monuments of the most costly kind, and gazed upon shrines radiant in jewels and gold; but we had witnessed nothing so touching as this simple coffin of wood, and this little chapel with its

unpretending decorations. They were in harmony with the character of him whose ashes they contained, and to whose last request we have just listened. We seemed to feel something of the influence spoken of by St. Chrysostom, when describing the chapel of the martyr Babylas: "A hallowed ether seemed to float around these sacred precincts; no earthly air, but a breathing from above, that penetrated to the very soul." We retired from this impressive scene full of feelings of veneration and awe.

> The bad man's death is horror: but the just
> Leave something of their glory in their dust.

The late Dr. Channing pronounced an eulogium on Fenelon; an extract or two may be acceptable to those who are not acquainted with the work. "We welcome a book from Fenelon. He wrote from his own mind, and seldom has a purer mind tabernacled in flesh. His works have the great charm of coming fresh from the soul. Fenelon saw far into the human heart, and especially into the lurkings of self-love. He looked with a piercing eye through the disguises of sin. But he knew sin, not, as most men do, by bitter experience of its power, so much as by his knowledge and experience of virtue. Deformity was revealed to him by his refined perception and intense love of moral beauty. The light which he carried with him into the dark corners of the human heart, and by which he laid open its most hidden guilt, was that of celestial goodness. Hence, though the severest of censors, he is the most pitying. Not a tone of asperity escapes him. He looks on human error with an angel's tenderness, with tears which an angel might shed, and thus reconciles and binds us to our race, at the very moment of revealing its corruptions.

"When we think of Fenelon in the palace of Louis XIV, it reminds us of a seraph sent on a divine commission into the abodes of the lost; and when we recollect that in such an atmosphere he composed his Telemachus, we doubt whether the records of the world furnish stronger evidence of the power of a divine virtue, to turn temptation into glory and strength, and to make even crowned and prosperous vice a means of triumph and exaltation.

"We said that we welcomed a book because it came from so pure and gifted a mind. We add, that we do not welcome it the less for coming from a Catholic. Perhaps we prize it the more: for we wish that Protestantism may grow wiser and more tolerant, and we know not a better teacher of these lessons than the character of Fenelon. Such a man is enough to place within the pale of our charity, the whole body to which he belonged. His virtue is broad enough to shield his whole Church from that unmeasured, undistinguishing reprobation, with which Protestant zeal has too often assailed it. Whoever remembers, that the Catholic communion numbers in its ranks more than one hundred millions of souls, probably more than all other Christian churches together, must shudder at the sentence of proscription, which has sometimes been passed on this immense portion of human beings. It is time that greater justice were done to this ancient and wide-spread community. The Catholic Church has produced some of the greatest and best men that ever lived, and this is proof enough of its possessing all the means of salvation. Who that hears the tone of contempt, in which it is sometimes named, would suspect that Charlemagne, Alfred, Raphael, Michael Angelo, Tasso, Fenelon, Bossuet, Pascal, Des Cartes, were Catholics? Some of the greatest names in arts and arms, on the throne and in the pulpit, were worn by Catholics. To come down to our own times, has not the metropolis of New England witnessed a sublime example of Christian virtue in a Catholic bishop? Who, among our religious teachers, would solicit a comparison between himself and the devoted Cheverus? This good man, whose virtues and talents raised him to high dignities in Church and state, who wore in his own country the joint honors of an archbishop and a peer, lived in the midst of us, devoting his days and nights, and his whole heart, to the service of a poor and uneducated congregation. We saw him declining, in a great degree, the society of the

cultivated and refined, that he might be the friend of the ignorant and friendless; leaving the circles of polished life, which he would have graced, for the meanest hovels; bearing with a father's sympathy, the burdens and sorrows of his large spiritual family, charging himself alike with their temporal and spiritual concerns; and never discovering, by the faintest indication, that he felt his fine mind degraded by his seemingly humble office. This good man, bent on the errands of mercy, was seen in our streets under the most burning sun of summer, and the fiercest storms of winter, as if armed against the elements by the power of charity. He has left us, but not to be forgotten. He enjoys among us what, to such a man, must have been dearer than fame. His name is cherished where the great of the world are unknown. It is pronounced with blessings, with grateful tears, with sighs for his loss, in many an abode of sorrow and want; and how can we shut our hearts against this proof of the power of the Catholic religion to form good and great men. . .

"When we look back on the history of papal Rome, we see her, in the days of her power, stained with the blood of martyrs. But what then? Is it righteous to involve a whole Church in guilt, which, after all, belongs to a powerful few? Is it righteous to forget, that Protestantism too has blood on her robes? Is it righteous to forget, that Time, the greatest of reformers, has exerted his silent, purifying power, on the Catholic as well as on ourselves? Shall we refuse to see, and to own with joy, that Christianity, even under papal corruptions, puts forth a divine power? Shall we shut our eyes to the fact, that, among the clergy of the Roman Church, have risen up illustrious imitators of that magnanimous apostle, before whom Felix trembled; men, who in the presence of nobles and kings, have bowed to God alone, have challenged for his law uncompromising homage, and rebuked in virtue's own undaunted tone triumphant guilt? Shall we shut our eyes to the fact, that, from the bosom of this Church, have gone forth missionaries to the east and to the west, whose toils and martyrdom will not be dimmed by comparison with what is most splendid in Protestant self-sacrifice. We are accustomed to refresh our piety by books which Catholics have written. Still we find one of our highest gratifications in those works of art, in which Catholic genius has embodied its sublime and touching conception, of the form and countenance of Jesus, has made us awed witnesses of his miracles and cross, companions of his apostles, and admirers, with a tender reverence, of the meek, celestial beauty of his sainted mother. With these impressions, and this experience, we cannot but lift up our voice against Protestant as well as papal intolerance."

One remark more, and we have done. Our faith has been calumniated and its features distorted to suit public interests, or individual malignity; it has been described, we have heard it done so in the pulpits of our cities, and the pulpit should be the chair of truth—we have heard it described as one mass of hopeless corruption, and therefore the generator of hopeless corruption instead of opposing reason to such calumnies, how much more satisfactory and convincing is it to oppose example; and we have one in Fenelon. In the memorable debates in the British parliament on the "Catholic Question," when so much misrepresentation of Catholic principles, not to say morals, was resorted to, more than once, when the powers of logic have been unavailing, all the clamor about Romish corruption, has been silenced by this simple remark,—"Could that be a corrupt Church which produced a Fenelon?"

Selected.

FILIAL RESPECT.

"Son, support the old age of thy father, and grieve him not in his life; and if his understanding fail, have patience with him, and despise him not when thou art in thy strength."—*Ecclesiasticus* iii, 14, 15.

Ah! grieve not him whose silver hairs
Thin o'er his wasted temples stray;
Grieve not thy sire when time impairs
The glory of his manhood's sway.

His tottering steps with reverence aid,
Bind his wan brow with honor's wreath,
And let his deafened ear be made
The harp where filial love shall breathe.

What, though his pausing mind partake
The evils of its house of clay,
Though wearied, blinded memory break
The casket where her treasures lay:

Still with prompt arm his burdens bear,
Bring heav'nly balm his wounds to heal,
And with affection's watchful care,
The error that thou mark'st, conceal.

Know'st thou how oft those powerless arms
Have clasped thee to his shielding breast,
When infant woes or childish harms
Thy weak, unguarded soul distressed?

Know'st thou how oft those accents strove
Thine uninstructed mind to aid?
How oft a parent's prayer of love
Hath pierced dense midnight's darkest shade?

Grieve not thy father till he die,
Lest when he sleeps in earth's cold breast,
The record of his lightest sigh
Should prove a dagger to thy rest.

For if this holiest debt of love,
Forgotten or despised should be,
He whom thou call'st thy Sire above,
Will bend a judge's frown on thee.

ST. PETER'S CHURCH AT ROME,

BY M. C. JENKINS.

IT is at Rome, of all places on earth, and at St. Peter's church of all other places in Rome, that we are made to feel how greatly is religious devotion assisted by external aids, how frequently revived in bosoms that may have ceased to feel its consoling impulses. Always has the Catholic acknowledged the importance of exterior agents in matters of religion, and wondered why modern reformers should have stripped religion of all her outward pomp, while they crowded style and ceremony on all profane things. They who are so shocked at the extrinsic helps of religious worship are seen to gaze with pleasure on the glittering pomp of a military display, and on the sash and apron of the odd fellow and mason. They legislate for the discipline, decorations, and ceremonies of their armies, navies, and embassies; and if some great work of improvement is to be commenced, or converts to be sought out for the temperance cause, a procession of the people with banner and badge is the surest expedient to give consequence and impressiveness to their laudable undertakings. Should a La Fayette come back in his old days to visit the country of his youthful love and chivalry, our cities are illuminated, our armies paraded and our utmost ingenuity is taxed to increase by ceremony, the effect and importance of the illustrious stranger's reception. And shall people who feel how interesting are these exterior auxiliaries to their civil concerns, how naturally they accompany popular fervor and enthusiasm, withhold from him alone to whom infinite gratitude is due, similar manifestations of their pious impulses and their religious ardor? If they do, at at least let them not condemn those who consider the reverence and homage conferred by ceremonies, infinitely more worthy of the Most High than of any mere creature of his hand. For as these external ceremonials of respect are graduated by the importance attached to the individual or occasion that calls them forth, the Catholic may be readily excused if his thoughts soar at once to the source of all majesty and greatness as the most fitting subject for all the pomp and circumstance of external reverence. It is some pleasure to us to see that a respectable portion of our Protestant brethren begin to view this subject with Catholic eyes. "Far be from us," says a writer in the New York Review, commenting on the rituals of his Protestant Church, "the absurd supposition that God surrounds man with all this bright host of powers in his own world, and all for nothing! No, they were meant, not less than the occupation of life, and the parental duties, to be important means in the work of culture. For grant them to be agencies at all, and they can be agencies only for good." The same writer continues in another place,—"Now it is to be considered that preaching is not the sole element of public Christian virtues. Prayer, poetry, music, architecture, in some form and in some way, are its fixed and established accompaniments." "We do not include paintings," says the same writer in a note, "because it contributes nothing to the ritual of Protestant churches. This has been regretted by many whose opinions deserve the highest respect." To improve these sentiments—to expand them to the Catholic standard of religious culture, it would be only necessary for a writer with such favorable prepossessions to visit with a proper spirit, the church of St. Peter at Rome. There indeed would he behold those external agencies which he desires to see established in his own church, developed in their utmost human perfection, and there would he see an enduring embodiment of all that gives grace, and awe, and dignity to religion, and strength and fervor to its followers. The most vivid description is but feeble to convey an adequate conception of this unrivalled temple of the living God. I have been almost afraid to mention St.

Peter's, says a manuscript now before me, of a dear deceased brother, lest I should inadvertently be guilty of the folly of attempting to describe it. It may be reasonably supposed that it was the first object to which my eager and highly excited curiosity was directed. Again and again have I visited it, and often again shall I return to exhaust hours after hours in wonder, amazement, and unspeakable admiration. Whether it be taken in its entirety or in parts, be it surveyed in a single, comprehensive glance, or examined in minute detail, see it by grand divisions of ceilings, aisles and walls, or stop before each chapel, altar, monument, picture and statue, and you will find all—every thing—magnificently grand, transcendently beautiful! The building, including the splendid colonnades, embraces an area of seven acres, of which four acres are comprehended in the interior of the church. It is situated at the north-west extremity of Rome, at the foot of the Vatican hill, and near the site of the gardens of Nero. In the year 323 Constantine built upon this site a large church, in honor of St. Peter, the prince of the apostles. In the middle of the fifteenth century this church was in a decayed and dilapidated condition. Nicholas V, who at that time reigned over the Church, conceived the idea of renovating it, and enlarging it to a scale worthy of its lofty purpose. To Julius II who was elevated to the papacy in 1503, belongs the glory of having commenced the design which his predecessor had so boldly conceived.

As you approach St. Peter's you are at once struck with its beautiful piazza, in every way worthy of the majestic pile to which it conducts you. It is adorned with a portico four columns deep, which opens out semi-circularly on either side before the façade of the church, and gives it a breadth proportioned to its depth. This colonnade forms a great covered gallery, surmounted by a balustrade, on which are placed one hundred and thirty-six statues of martyrs, founders of religious orders, and at intervals by the arms of the sovereign pontiff under whom it was erected.

"Alexander VII laid the first stone of this portico on the 25th of August, 1661. It was built on the plan and under the inspection of Bernini. In the middle of the piazza is an obelisk, of one block of granite, seventy-four feet high, and which, with the pedestal it rests upon and the cross by which it is surmounted, rises to one hundred and twenty-four feet from the ground. This obelisk is one of those attributed to Pheron, the son of Sesostris, who, according to Herodotus, had consecrated two obelisks in the temple of the Sun. The emperor Caligula brought it from Alexandria to Rome. The ship employed for this purpose was, according to Pliny, the most extraordinary that ever moved upon the waters, and was itself a real wonder. This obelisk remained standing in the circus of Nero, when Nicholas V conceived the idea of transporting it to the piazza of St. Peter's; but death prevented him from executing this project. Paul III wished Michael Angelo Buonarotti to undertake the task; but he declined, fearing that he should not be able to overcome the difficulties with which it was attended. Thirty years later Sixtus V ascended the pontifical throne. Endowed with a firm and enterprising character—such as was required for the government of the Church, then assailed by furious tempests—this pontiff was, perhaps, not sorry to show the world that he was not to be retarded by obstacles deemed insurmountable by his predecessors. His first care was to make efforts to adorn the piazza of St. Peter's with this monument. With this view he invited to Rome many architects and machinists. They assembled from all Italy, and some even came from Greece. More than five hundred plans were presented, and a committee was named to examine them. After a long investigation, this committee adopted the plan of Dominico Fontana, reserving, however, the execution of it to two more aged, and, therefore, more experienced architects. The Pope thought this an injustice; and rightly judging that the inventor of such a plan was most capable of executing it, he ordered him to undertake it, and vested him with extraordinary power.

"The greatest difficulty arose from the size

of the obelisk, which, according to the calculations of Fontana, weighs nine hundred and sixty-three thousand, five hundred and thirty-seven Roman pounds. On the 15th of April, 1586, it was raised two palms (seventeen and a half inches) from its pedestal; on the 7th of May it was lowered to the ground, and notwithstanding the short distance, four months were occupied in transporting it to the place where it was to be erected. Finally, on the 10th of September, by the aid of forty-four machines, moved by eight hundred men and one hundred and fifty horses, it was gradually raised, and placed perpendicularly on enormous bars of iron, which sustained it on its resting place. This was the work of five hours.

"Immediately the firing of cannon, and the ringing of bells announced a result so glorious for the architect, and so satisfactory to the Pontiff. It is, however, related that Fontana was mistaken in his calculation relative to the length of the ropes; and that the obelisk would not have been raised, had not a sailor from San Remo, named Bresca, perceiving the defect, cried out, in defiance of the prohibition to speak under pain of death: 'Wet the ropes;' and by this means apprised the architect of the defect, and pointed out its remedy. It is added, that to reward this brave man, he and his descendants were invested with the privilege of furnishing palms on Palm Sunday to the Roman churches. 'Perhaps,' remarks the writer from whom I have borrowed this anecdote, 'this is one of the thousand tales by which mediocrity consoles itself for the success of superior talents.' This fact, however, is represented in the frescoes of the Vatican library. On the twenty-seventh of the same month, the obelisk was blessed after a solemn procession, and on its summit was placed the sign of our redemption, as is the case with the other obelisks of Rome. The expenses incurred were forty thousand dollars.

"The granite of which the obelisk is formed, is a very hard stone, composed of black-spotted red stones. It was known to the ancients by the name of Sienite marble. 'The kings,' says Pliny, speaking of the shepherd-kings of Egypt, 'emulously employed Sienite marble to make a kind of beam which they called obelisks, and which they consecrated to the Sun. Their form represents in some manner the rays of this luminary; and in the Egyptian language the world itself signifies a ray. They were introduced by Nuncoree, who reigned in the city of the Sun; he had received in a dream an order to make them, and had many imitators.' It is, then, probable that these obelisks belong to the most remote antiquity. When the Roman emperors became masters of Egypt, they transported several of them to Rome to adorn its public piazzas, its circus, and the other places where they loved to display their magnificence. What is particularly remarkable in the obelisk of which we have been speaking, as well as in two others, less considerable, which were formerly before the mausoleum of Augustus, and which are now—one behind St. Mary Major, the other at Monte Cavallo, is, that no hieroglyphics are found on them, while, according to Champollion, the monuments which were placed before temples, had an historic character, and required an inscription. . . . .

"At an equal distance, on each side of the obelisk, are two fountains, which cast up their waters from a double basin of granite. They produce a fine effect, and contribute much to the ornament of the *piazza*, by the quantity of water they uninterruptedly spout up to such a height, that they form, in rising, a thick and white sheaf which dissolves in spray in the descent. The first time that Christina of Sweden saw this spectacle, she was struck with it; and, thinking that it was exhibited on her account, she thanked the attendants by whom she was accompanied, and told them to stop the waters. What was her surprise on being told that they had not ceased to play thus for a century! The water comes from a distance of twenty-four miles; it rises to an elevation of about twenty-two feet, and the basin into which it falls is eighty-six feet in circumference. This water would move large mills.

"If the *piazza* of St. Peter's delights the lovers of art by the beauties it presents to

their admiration, it no less captivates the faithful Christian, by the recollections it suggests. Here was the circus of Nero; it was the theatre of his madness, where he glutted himself with the torments and carnage of the Christians. Fire having consumed almost the entire city of Rome, in his reign, it was thought that Nero himself was the author of the conflagration. Wishing to silence the seditious rumors that were in circulation against him, and to give the public hatred another direction, he accused the Christians of the crime, and ordered them to be persecuted. Not satisfied with the ordinary punishments, he invented others before unheard of, and surpassed even himself in cruelty. Many Christians were enclosed in the skins of wild animals, and devoured as such by dogs. Others were besmeared with pitch, and impaled on stakes; fire was applied, and by the light of those horrible torches, the emperor was accustomed to walk by night in his gardens, drive his chariot, and sing verses, unmoved by the cries of his expiring victims. It was in this persecution that St. Peter and St. Paul terminated their lives by martyrdom. For eighteen centuries have the faithful come here, from all parts of the world, to venerate their remains. Thus, altars have been erected on the earth, which was moistened with the blood of the martyrs; and it is not without a particular providence of God, that the basilica of the prince of the apostles is built on the spot where the palace of the first persecutor once stood.

"The ascent to the church is by a magnificent flight of steps, which are almost entirely of marble; and at the bottom of which are two statues of St. Peter and St. Paul. On ascending you admire more and more the façade, which is three hundred and seventy feet in breadth, and one hundred and forty-nine in height. The proportions are so admirable, that its columns appear of ordinary dimensions, and must be approached before they can be estimated. Each column with its pedestal and capital is eighty-three feet high, and eight feet and three inches in diameter. This façade, although majestic, is somewhat low for its breadth. Probably the architect, Carlo Maderno, preferred that it should have this defect, than that it should conceal the cupola, the imposing *coup d'œil* of which constitutes the greatest ornament of the church.

"The vestibule is entered by five openings. At the sides of this vestibule are two galleries, which present at their extremities an equestrian statue of heroic appearance, placed in a deep recess, covered with a canopy and drapery. On the right is Constantine; on the left Charlemagne. Constantine is represented at the moment when he beholds the cross, under which he was to conquer; Charlemagne is crowned with laurel, after the manner of the Roman emperors.

"Corresponding with the five gates of the façade are five doors which open into the church. That on the right is walled up; it is called the holy gate; and since the year 1500, the solemnity of the jubilee is commenced every twenty-five years, by the opening of this gate, which ceremony is intended to represent the opening of a time of grace and mercy. It is again shut at the termination of the jubilee. On the wall which closes up this entrance is a cross of gilt bronze: pilgrims kiss it as they pass, and scrape away some of the plaster, which they bring home as a relic. The folds of the middle door are entirely of bronze, on it are *bas relief* representations of some portions of sacred history, and some facts of the life of Eugene IV, under whom it was made. Over the gate is a *bas relief* by Bernini, representing Jesus Christ giving the care of his sheep to Peter, to whom he addresses the words: 'Feed my sheep;'—words which alone suffice to confute heresy and schism. All the gates are adorned with columns of beautiful marble.

"Let us now enter the church. This edifice, from the entrance to the end of the tribuna, is six hundred and fourteen English feet in length; notwithstanding this extent, the first *coup d'œil* produces no feeling of surprise. All parts are so well proportioned that nothing appears long, or broad, or high; because nothing is seen there that could make the building appear so; that is, there is nothing short, low, or small in it. Thus the greatest astonishment felt on

first entering this most beautiful of Christian churches, is the absence of this feeling.

"Enter—its grandeur overwhelms thee not;
And why? It is not lessened; but thy mind,
Expanded by the genius of the spot,
Has grown colossal, and can only find
A fit abode wherein appear enshrined
Thy hopes of immortality; and thou
Shalt one day, if found worthy, so refined,
See thy God face to face, as thou dost now
His holy of holies, nor be blasted by his brow."

"It is only after repeated visits, after having considered all its details, that an idea can be formed of this immense edifice, which continually presents new subjects of admiration. When thus examined, some defects will be perceived in it; for man is imperfect, and the master-pieces of his skill betray the imperfection of their author. But these defects do not offend the eye, they are unperceived in the general beauty of the building.

"On the right side, at the end of the grand nave, is seen an ancient bronze statue of St. Peter, which is much venerated. The saint is seated on a marble chair; with one hand he blesses the people, and with the other he holds the keys, the symbol of the authority God gave him on earth. The feet are always kept shining, and the right foot has been almost worn away, by the piety of the people, who reverently kiss them as a sign of their submission to the vicar of Jesus Christ. On St. Peter's day this statue is dressed with pontifical ornaments. According to the archives of the church, St. Leo made this statue, when Rome was delivered from the threatened invasion of Attila; a circumstance in which that Pontiff had a great part, but which he referred entirely to the intercession of the apostles. It was originally placed in the monastery of St. Martin, and was removed to its present position by Paul V.

"At the extremity of the middle nave is the pontifical altar, which was erected and consecrated by Clement VIII, in 1594. The table of this altar is a beautiful slab of marble, more than fourteen feet in length, and upwards of six feet in breadth. In this altar, according to a respectable tradition, is contained an altar dedicated to St. Peter, in the time of St. Sylvester and Constantine. The Pope officiates at this altar three times in the year; at Christmas, Easter, and on the feast of St. Peter. He alone has a right to say mass at it; and if a cardinal supplies his place, as is generally the case on the feast of the Chair of St. Peter, he receives permission for that purpose, by a special brief which only avails for that time. Over the pontifical altar is a colossal baldachino, or canopy, of costly materials and antique form. The top is of gilt bronze; it is in the form of a canopy, and sustained by four spiral columns of the same metal, entwined with vine branches, which rise as high as the Corinthian capitals. At each corner of the canopy are groups of angels; some holding a tiara, keys, and other emblems of pontifical authority; while others have garlands of flowers, which they seem about to throw on the altar. This admirable composition, the greatest that is known in bronze, was executed by Bernini, under the pontificate of Urban VIII. The escutcheon of this pontiff is seen on the pedestal of each column. To cast this canopy cost sixty thousand dollars, and the gilding of it forty thousand dollars. The metal was purchased at Venice; one hundred and eighty-six thousand Roman pounds of it were employed.*

"Fifteen years later, after the plan of the same Bernini, and by the orders of Alexander VII, was erected at the extremity of the church the superb monument called the Chair of St. Peter. The chair is sustained by two Latin fathers, St. Ambrose and St. Augustin; and by two Greek fathers, St. Chrysostom and St. Athanasius; and is surmounted by two genii who appear to protect it. Above shines a large glory, in the midst of which is the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove. The rays of this glory are brilliant, because the work is entirely of gilt bronze, and it is illumined by glasses, which increase the effect of the gilding. This chair of bronze is a reliquary, in which the identical chair used by St. Peter is religiously preserved. It is of wood, and adorned with small columns. All around are figures of ivory. The back was somewhat injured, but it has been strengthened

* The Roman pound contains but twelve ounces.

by an iron band; and at the sides are the hooks, through which were passed the poles that served to carry the Pope on the day of his coronation, as has been the practice for many ages. Under the pontifical altar is a subterranean chapel; and in this chapel, where the first Christians were wont to assemble, and which the faithful of following times have adorned, is a tomb containing the relics of the great apostles. It is called the confession of St. Peter, although this name is extended to the great altar erected over it. The descent is by a double stairway of white marble, encircled by a balustrade of variegated marble, and bearing ninety lamps which burn day and night. These lamps are of gilt copper; formerly they were of silver, but in the evil days which closed the last century, the French took possession of them. The walls of the interior are incrusted with precious stones. The gate which leads to the tomb is of gilt bronze. Opposite this gate is the colossal statue of the venerable Pius VI, in the attitude of prayer. It is one of the masterpieces of Canova.

"The lamps of the altar of St. Peter are extinguished on Good Friday. Their absence was formerly supplied by a spectacle no less brilliant than solemn. A metal cross, twenty-five feet high, and lit with three hundred and fourteen small lamps, was suspended from the top of the canopy, which formed a brilliant *coup d'œil*, and produced an extraordinary effect. Notwithstanding the extent of this basilica, the cross illumined the two great naves, and could be seen even from the extremity of the piazza. It was precisely the effect which it produced, that moved Leo XII, in 1824, to prohibit it; since that time it has not been exhibited. Young artists were accustomed to watch this moment to catch the *chiari scuri*, and sketch the beautiful reflections of light and shade. What was still more scandalous, a number of strangers assembled, and, regardless of the sacred sign of our redemption, profaned the sanctity of the place, and offered insult to the mystery, the remembrance of which was renewed on that day. That day is still a day of Christian sorrow; the sanctuary is in mourning, the altar is without sacrifice; and if the Christian does not always abstain from labor, it is because labor is one of the punishments of sin, and the day of the Saviour's death, ought to be a day of penance. Honor, then, is due to the sovereign pontiff, who, in abolishing what he could not correct, at least saved the cross from the fresh outrages which heresy and infidelity would have offered. And who were those strangers who in the capital of Christendom, in a temple most calculated to inspire sublime thoughts, came, on that holy day, to mock at the faith of Christians—to laugh, to chat, to eat, and act in a manner they would not presume to do in a Turkish mosque? There were Christians among them; but those erring Christians, whom unjust prejudices and secret interests keep separated from the Church of their ancestors. They were those English, who would scruple, in London, to touch a *piano* on Sunday; they were natives of a certain part of Germany, who preserve so gloomy a silence in their naked temples. Among them might be seen some young Frenchmen, in whom devotion to the arts extinguished other and better feelings, and who admit no religion that cannot be demonstrated by algebra! These were the people who came to outrage God in his mysterious humiliations. There are, doubtless, exceptions; all those who cultivate the arts, are not, therefore, to be ranked with the incredulous. Many English have preserved a respect for holy things, and are not prepared to offend public decency. All the Protestants of Germany do not regard the cross as a sign of superstition; for I can affirm that more than one of their ministers has a crucifix in his domestic oratory. It is, however, true, that on the great solemnities, when religion displays at Rome more pomp and magnificence, strangers assemble in greater number, and give more than ordinary scandal. Curiosity is not the only motive which brings them; they come with perfidious intentions; and on their return to their country they charge the Roman church with the disorders of which they themselves were the authors. . . . .

"I have spoken of the 'Confession' of

St. Peter, and what struck me most in the grand nave of the church. I would never finish if I were to pass thence to the side naves, and attempt a description of the beautiful chapels and splendid mausoleums they contain. All these chapels are admirable for the mosaics, the statuary and painting with which they are decorated. What most strikes the stranger who sees them for the first time, and considers them separately, is, that they all appear as large as churches; and in proportion as he recedes from them, they re-enter as it were, into their fitting proportions, and appear once more chapels. Hence he is enabled to estimate more correctly the extent of each part, and to judge better of the dimensions of the whole.

"In one of these chapels is a statue of the Blessed Virgin, holding her dead son in her arms. This group is regarded as one of the master-pieces of Michael Angelo, and was executed by him in his twenty-fifth year. The Gregorian chapel is so called from Gregory XIII, who constructed it, and who had the satisfaction to see it completed in his pontificate. It cost him more than six hundred thousand dollars. Under the altar, which is exceedingly rich, rests the body of St. Gregory of Nazianzen, transferred hither in 1580. Near this is the body of Gregory himself, who died in 1585. The *bas relief*, on the front of the tomb, represents the reformation of the calendar, which was made in 1582, by the exertions of this pontiff, and was at length adopted even by the Protestants.

"Two other mausoleums particularly struck me: that of Christina, queen of Sweden, who died at Rome in 1689; there is on it a *bas relief*, representing the abjuration of Lutheranism made by her at Inspruck, in 1655: the other of the celebrated Countess Matilda, whose ashes were removed from Mantua to Rome by Urban VIII. This countess having defended the Popes, is represented with a sceptre in the right hand, and the tiara and keys on the left arm. On the *bas relief* of this monument is seen Gregory VII, at Canossa, giving absolution to Henry IV, who is prostrate at his feet."

But perhaps the most astonishing part of St. Peter's is its magnificent cupola. The Pantheon undoubtedly suggested the first idea of this bold undertaking. "The temple of all the Gods" was a model of architecture which found admirers in all the artists of Europe. The multitude appeared surprised that the earth sustained its weight. "I will hang it in the air," said Michael Angelo, and he raised the dome of St. Peter's. This prince of artists, at the age of eighty-one was extremely desirous of ending his days at Florence, whither he had been so often invited by the Duke Cosmo, and so earnestly by Vasuri. He was prevented from so doing, not so much from his years, as from the interest he took in the building of St. Peter's, which, under his eye, underwent continual alterations, through the inexperience of workmen, and the malignity of persons interested in protracting the work. Among the architects of St. Peter's, was the Signor Don Pirro Ligorio, a Neapolitan nobleman of Portu Nuova. He treated Michael Angelo as in his second childhood, and wished in consequence to alter the order of the building. Paul IV, was indignant at such treatment, and deprived Don Pirro of his charge. Michael Angelo was a rock against which beat the storm of envy, calumny, and the malice of all those who expected to derive some benefit from the fabric. At his advanced age Buonarotti saw the edifice completed as far as the beautiful drum of travertine, on which was to be placed the cupola. The friends of Michael Angelo, and especially Cardinal di Carpi, induced him in consequence of the comparative lowness and want of talent in others, to make a model for the cupola, notwithstanding his years. He at length completed a small one in clay, from which one was formed of wood, after much labor and study on the part of Buonarotti. This model was the admiration of every one, and at length executed under Sixtus V.

"The drum of this amazing cupola is sustained by arches which rest on pilasters, about two hundred and thirty feet in circumference. At the foot of these pilasters are chapels, adorned with colossal statues

of St. Andrew, St. Veronica, St. Helena and St. Longinus. These statues are beautiful, and have a reference to the four most precious relics of the church, after those of the apostles: that is, the handkerchief with which St. Veronica wiped the sacred face of Jesus, on the way to Calvary; a piece of the wood of the true cross, which St. Helen was so happy as to discover; the lance with which the soldier, known since by the name of Longinus, pierced the side of our Lord; and the head of St. Andrew. These relics are exhibited to the people on certain days. They are preserved in beautiful niches above one of the statues, and to which an ascent has been made within the thick pilasters. The canons of St. Peter alone are permitted to ascend; whoever desires to participate in the privilege must first be made an honorary canon of this church, a favor which is only granted to foreigners of great distinction. In 1625, Urban VIII gave this title to Ladislas, who was subsequently king of Poland, and in 1700, Innocent XII conferred it on Cosmo III, Grand Duke of Tuscany. In more ancient times, in 1425, the Emperor Frederick III, having come to Rome for the ceremony of his coronation, received from Nicholas V permission to wear a canon's dress, and see the handkerchief of St. Veronica. The cupola is crowned by a lantern; and this lantern which, from the piazza, appears so light, is itself a second cupola, around which persons may safely walk. The ball of gilt bronze, which surmounts it, is more than eight feet in diameter, and can contain fifteen persons very conveniently. The cross on the top is thirteen feet high."

"Though every thing in this church is admirable," says Addison, "the most astonishing part of it is the cupola. It is not easy to conceive a more glorious show in architecture than what a man meets with when he stands under the dome. If he looks upward he is astonished at the spacious hollow, and has a vault on every side of him that affords one of the most beautiful vistas that the eye can possibly pass through. Upon my going to the top of it I was astonished to find that the dome seen in the church, is not the same with that seen without doors; the last being a kind of case to the other, the stairs lying between them both by which one ascends into the ball." When upon the roof of the dome you perceive you have never before had any just conception of its magnitude. The roof of this church seems of itself a little city covered with towns, cottages, cisterns, plains, and hills, slopes and precipices. They indeed are fortunate who after having indulged their wonder on this gigantic dome, should have seen the ceremony of its illumination on Easter night. It is the grandest, the most brilliant, the most awfully superb spectacle, says a manuscript before me, I ever witnessed on earth. The process of illumination commences immediately after dusk, when the whole of that dome, itself a prodigy of beauty, symmetry, and immensity, is lighted up with innumerable lamps, from the top of the cross on the ball to its base. The effect is inimitable both from the countless number of the lights and the order and elegance of their arrangement. I gazed at it steadfastly for an hour, and was still gazing in wonder and delight, when suddenly, and as if by magic these thousands of lamps which until then had been but separate lights, mingled their flames and transformed the dome into an immense orb of liquid fire, while upon its summit shone forth in brilliant triumph the Christian's standard—the glorious cross. To the extent of man's limited capacity, this gorgeous exhibition was worthy of the object it was intended to celebrate—the triumph of Christ in his glorious resurrection. There is something in the idea of such a celebration most beautifully touching and effecting. To see the banner of our religion, the emblem of all our hopes, reaching almost to the very regions of heaven, and from its immense height illuminating the earth below by its resplendent brilliancy! To see that cross thus blazing aloft over the prostrate ruins of pagan Rome, the proud and relentless persecutrix of the followers and principles of the crucified God! To see that cross reared by the descendants of its own persecutors, and now by them so honored and so reverenced. What a crowd

of pregnant reflections do not such circumstances awaken in the mind!

From this account of St. Peter's church, a faint idea may be formed of its immensity and of that

"haughty dome which vies
In air with earth's chief structures, though their frame
Sits on the firm-set ground, and this the clouds must claim."

"A greater quantity of stones," says a celebrated writer, "could be raised to a greater height on a more extended base, but of so many colossal parts to compose a whole which appears simple and grand, from such accumulated riches to compose a monument, which is so purely magnificent, and by an astonishing harmony of proportions form one prodigy of so many united wonders—this is the master piece of art, and the work of Michael Angelo."

A few words may be well added on the time required for the construction of St. Peter's, the number of Popes who contributed to it and the sums expended on it.

"Julius II laid the first stone of this church on the 18th of April, 1506. He had adopted the plan of the celebrated Bramante, with whom the idea of the cupola originated. The eagerness of the Pontiff was zealously seconded; and although already in his seventieth year, he had the satisfaction, before his death, of seeing the pillars, that were to support the cupola, raised as far as the cornice. This precipitation might have injured the solidity of the building; but after the deaths of Julius and Bramante, Leo X employed architects, who strengthened the pillars already commenced, and made some change in the original plan, in consequence of the enormous expense it would require. At the death of Leo X the work was suspended, and was not resumed till the pontificate of Paul III. The architect chosen by this Pontiff proposed a new plan; and this was about being adopted when Michael Angelo appeared, who gave one that was not to be subject to alteration. All his designs were approved. . . Having labored at the Basilica, under five different Popes, he died in 1564. The architects who succeeded him were ordered to adopt his designs, and one of them lost his place, for having departed from them.

"Finally, forty-six years after, under Paul V, Maderno finished the church, and raised its façade; under Alexander VII Bernini constructed the portico which encloses the piazza; and finally, almost in our days, the unfortunate Pius VI added the sacristy, which is so necessary for church-service, but for which, however, Michael Angelo had reserved no place, either in the interior or exterior of the church—as he wished that the edifice should be detached from all additions, and perfectly regular, both in the interior and exterior. This sacristy was begun in 1776; it was finished in 1780, and consecrated on the 15th of June, 1784. If from that day, to which the completion of the entire work is to be assigned, we go back to the time when Julius II laid the first stone, we will find an interval of almost three centuries. In this interval thirty-four Popes governed the church.

"It is not easy to determine the sums of money expended on this immense building. According to the calculation of Fontana, who has left an accurate account of them, the expense in 1693 amounted to $47,000,000. To this sum must be added the gilding, sculpture, paintings, mosaics, and so many other ornaments since the time of Fontana; and, last, the new *sacristy*. It will not be extravagant to estimate the total expense at $50,000,000."

It should be remembered also, that Michael Angelo, in gratitude for the confidence reposed in him by the Pope, in naming him architect of St. Peter's, declared that he would attend the building for the love of God without any reward whatever. This declaration, says his biographer, was not like many others, made in the spirit of vain glory, for when the Pope afterwards wished to remunerate him, he could not be induced to accept any thing. By changing the designs of his predecessor Sangallo, he also cured many defects in the architecture of the church, and saved fifty years of time and three hundred thousand scudi. To his great accomplishments as an artist Michael Angelo united all the mascu-

line and moral virtues. He was a good Christian, destitute of resentment, modest and patient. He frequently lived for whole days on a little bread and wine, that he might pay the greater attention to his work. Disinterested in the extreme, he refused every species of reward; liberal with his own he gave much to his friends. His will was comprised in three sentences. "My soul to God, my body to the earth, and my estate to my nearest relatives." Princes lavished their honors and attention on Buonarotti. When Cosmo I, of Florence, went to Rome, he not only insisted on Angelo's being covered, but seated him between his knees almost on them. Ottaviono de Medici solicited him to stand sponsor to his son, and Cardinal Ippolito having heard that the artist was pleased with a Turkish horse belonging to him, sent it, with ten mules laden with corn, and a groom to attend them. Francis I, desired his services, and ordered him to receive three thousand crowns to enable him to undertake the journey. The Emperor Charles V, rose on seeing him and exclaimed: "Emperors may be found, but never your equal."

Translated from the French.

THE MAMMOTH CAVE IN KENTUCKY,

AS DESCRIBED IN A LETTER OF THE REV. W. MURPHY, S. J.

WE left Lebanon, a little village near our college, the 9th of August, 1841, at eleven o'clock at night, and took our places in a stage for the south. The next day, at sunrise, we were in the centre of Green county, celebrated throughout the state for the excellent tobacco it produces. The country in this part of Kentucky is excessively monotonous; continual forests in the midst of which immense clearings leave exposed a rich soil of deep alluvial or vegetable mould accumulated since the origin of the world. Here the indolent slaves lightly pass the ploughshare through the earth, covering with a little soil the grains of maize or tobacco which they have carelessly sown for their masters; and notwithstanding so much negligence, the broomcorn with its superb tassel of stamens rises to the height of fifteen feet, and the tobacco supports upon strong stems its beautiful pyramid of large and velvet leaves, surmounted by innumerable clusters of bell-shaped flowers. The tobacco known in France, as Virginia, is oftener if it come from America at all, the production of Kentucky, more particularly of Green county. Virginia is exhausted, our soil is still fertile; but improvidence and cupidity will very soon produce here the same effects which they have already caused on the other side of the Alleghanies. The day of the 10th of August had not yet closed when the aspect of the country through which we travelled entirely changed; we were about to enter the Barrens. Eighty years ago no European had settled in this country, and Kentucky, or "the bloody ground," was either the property of the Cherokees or a neutral territory upon which many savage tribes came to chase in turn. In these great hunts the trees it is said were cut down, the underwood burnt, and the surface of the ground became a kind of smooth plain where the game of the red man could neither be concealed nor escape his arrow. It is an astonishing fact that a third, or at least a fourth of Kentucky, a space which is equal to a third of France, was found thus stripped and bare when the first Virginians emigrated thither. They then attributed the absence of trees to the sterility of the soil, and applied to it the name of the Barrens, which I freely translate into French, by the word *landes*. Since then the trees and shrubs have again covered the

surface, and now present all the freshness of youth and an immense richness of vegetation; while nevertheless a name, now so inappropriate, will probably attach to it forever; because in languages reason never prevails against custom. Nothing could be more agreeable to us than the sight of the charming country which we were about to enter. There were no more fallen trees, no more great oaks scathed by lightning, no more immense vegetable remains which render the forests of America so desolate—in the eyes of a naturalist, as it were a field of battle strewn with dead bodies. In the Barrens nature is young; one does not yet see there the impress of death, it is a lovely country, a paradise freshly created. Verdant trees rise towards heaven and interlace their vigorous limbs: we see, and feel that life circulates in their branches, that the vessels which convey their nourishment are not yet closed by age. This continued forest of fifty years growth, is like a parterre of flowers in the month of May. But before arriving at the cavern which is to be the end of our journey, some general considerations upon the geological formations of this country would aid us to comprehend the astonishing phenomena which we were about to witness. All the learned agree in classing the vast plain which extends from the Alleghanies to the Rocky mountains, and from the lakes of Canada to the gulf of Mexico, among the secondary and transition formations. But this classification is excessively vague, and that branch of the geological series comprehends in all parts of the globe an astonishing variety of earths which science has not yet agreed to arrange. Each author has upon this point his own system, and it may be confidently asserted that the great difficulties of geology consist in this. In considering the features of Kentucky, we shall find it naturally divided into two regions, each perfectly characterised. The north and the east present principally specimens of the colithic and carbonic groups: lime abounds under the form of fossils; streams of water are numerous on the surface of the soil which is rendered excessively rich by powerful alluvions. The south and west on the contrary, are undoubtedly to be placed in the group of red and mixed earths, and astonishing as it may appear, fossils there are almost totally wanting. I have discovered in that part of the country only some cyatophylla of three different kinds. Streams are rarely visible, their sources find subterranean conduits or lose themselves deep in the earth, and the soil thus presents beneath its surface a multitude of caverns and channels where the sand produced from the decomposition of the free-stone constantly accumulates. When the natural pillars which sustain these great vaults, fall under the weight of the earth and trees above them, a hole or cavity of a tunnel shape is formed at the surface, where the waters are engulfed, and thence filter into deeper caverns, depositing the lime which they contain in solution under the fantastic forms of varied stalactites. This is the whole secret of the formation of the cavern which we were about to penetrate. The grand, almost terrible aspect that the hills and vallies assume, at the bottom of which is the entrance of the Mammoth cave, prepares the soul for the emotions it is about to experience. The gigantic trees, the piles of rocks, the increasing obscurity, all vividly impress the imagination. The sun scarcely penetrates into the bottom of the valley, one seems about to quit the regions of light for that sombre empire which the Greeks peopled with phantoms and wandering spirits. As we approached it, the first sentiment was that of wonder and a sort of fear. A cavern thirty-five feet broad, twenty high, and at least fifty feet deep is terminated interiorly by a narrow gate which marks the limits of light and darkness. Before passing the threshold a spontaneous and invincible movement impels one to return, to throw a last look on the blue heaven which God has extended for man's pavilion. Oh! how brilliant then appears the light which plays at the entrance of the cave in the large leaves of the wild balsamines, or on the waving branches of the thorns. But we must proceed; the negro who serves as guide would laugh at your simplicity if you spoke one word to him of the sentiments which fill your soul.

The threshold is past, and we are in the main cave. A nave without support, one hundred fathoms long, from eighty to one hundred and ten feet high, and fifty broad, forms the prodigious sarcophagus in which you are for the moment buried. The light of the lamps which the travellers hold in their hands is lost in the depth of the abyss. You see it at the distance of a few paces struggling against the shadows which darken around it. To discern an object, we must stop, enlarge the pupil and hold the lamp near. The flame of a torch disseminated in a space much too vast to be fully enlightened, adds more grandeur to the objects which surround us. No human architecture has ever furnished such imposing models. The gothic cathedrals of old Europe do not so entirely overpower the mind by their gigantic mass. At the end of this long avenue many branches of the main cave open in different directions. They bear some resemblance to the catacombs of Rome. But the emotions of the soul are of a very different character. It is not the sweet and melancholy remembrance of those sad yet glorious days when so many martyrs were immolated, it is not that unutterable sentiment of the Christian at the sight of the blood stained cradle of his dear and holy religion, but in considering these obscure galleries which extend to unknown distances and in various directions, the soul reviews the terrible catastrophes which formerly created these tortuous and sombre avenues. Whether one goes back to those first days when the earth, still under the action of the creative power, was a prey to the convulsions which preceded equilibrium and order, when, according to the energetic expression of Scripture, the mountains were exalted and the valleys made low; whether the mind stops in ascending the long succession of ages at the frightful deluge which overwhelmed the terrestrial surface with deep waters; whether one is contented with supposing a general cause, or seeks to explain all by a partial catastrophe, by an earthquake acting simultaneously with an inundation, or the sudden change of the course of waters, one must always suppose a prodigious lapse of time and an extraordinary power to produce such results. The general impression produced in my mind by the sight of such a scene, is a sort of conviction that a sudden revolution of nature was at first necessary to commence the excavation of this cavern. The slow action of time is a term without meaning if secondary causes also are not reckoned: an inconsiderable stream could never have hollowed out, no matter in how long a series of ages, in such vast proportions, channels so multiplied, so monstrously great, and which have evidently been filled to the brink with water. But if we suppose, in addition, a *powerful* stream of water there must have been from the beginning, a way under the earth sufficiently large to allow it to pass. But this digression is already too long, time presses, we must proceed. Not wishing to prolong our first visit over five hours, we took another day for the exploration of the river. We traversed a suite of grottoes and avenues, such as are generally seen where nature has created subterranean cavities. The only thing which struck us here was, the evidences of the little respect which travellers have shown for this wonderful curiosity of the new world. The calcareous incrustations which formerly decorated the "Gothic avenue," the "temple," the "chapel," &c. now strew the ground; the wrecks only remain suspended from the walls and vaults to excite the regrets of the traveller; thousands of names also are inscribed on every side, as if the authors of these devastations feared that they should not be known. We stopped in the small apartment called the Haunted chamber, where those who first penetrated into the cavern found mummies, which it is said are now in Peale's museum. Among many others, the body of a woman, swathed and bound with little fillets like the Egyptian mummies, attracted particular attention: from her arm was suspended a bag filled with needles and jewels; she was seated, and of small stature; her features indicated a variety of the human race different from the red man, and if this singular fact is connected with the curious discoveries of Mr. Stephens in central America, where he

saw the remains of pyramids and colossal statues, of palaces where the full arch is not known, covered with hieroglyphics and bas-reliefs, figures of gods and heroes so like those which are still found in the ruins of Memphis and of Thebes, one cannot doubt the identity of the ancient Egyptians with the primitive American race. The valuable book of the envoy extraordinary from the United States to Guatimala is of itself a perfect demonstration of this identity, notwithstanding the preconceptions and prejudices of the author, who, in order to follow the systems of some illustrious travellers and geographers, draws at the end of his work a consequence contrary to all the laws of induction. But the discovery of the mummies in the mammoth cave is as one may say, the final destruction of the theory of autochtones,* borrowed from the Greeks, to the shame of our age, and sustained without reflection by learned men of the first order. If what a traveller relates is true, this cavern is destined to furnish hereafter important information upon the ancient population of the American continent. While excavations were being made here in 1810, for the purpose of obtaining saltpetre for the manufacture of powder, of which the republic was absolutely in want during its second struggle with England, one of the workmen found, it is said, two or three other mummies, which he returned to their first resting-place, and covered again with earth that he might not trouble the ashes of the dead. This fact is related by Davidson in his "Excursion to the Mammoth cave." Who knows then if hereafter one may not meet here with another Necropolis, as worthy of the researches of the learned as that of old Egypt. I love to hope that Providence will grant this favor to our posterity, and will thus convince the most incredulous of the unity of the human race, so monstrously combated even at this day. The "haunted chamber" suggested to us the preceding reflections; the sight of the "temple" surprised us after all the wonders we had seen.

*This expression designates the first inhabitants of a country, in opposition to those, who may have afterwards established themselves therein.

A circular space which the guides say comprehends about eight acres, and which more moderate visiters reduce to four, presents itself far below the surface of the earth, whose immense vault is entirely unsupported. The action of the waters which formerly created it, has adorned its walls with draperies, festooned in various fantastical or graceful forms, as in gothic churches the chisel of the architect has designed arabesques, foliage, and elegant garlands. The pantheon of Agrippa then returned to my thoughts, as the sublime diminutive of the colossal vault before me. The last complete remnant of Roman architecture at that time seemed to me like the little model in clay, which the sculptor forms before taking his chisel to design the athletic members, the swelling muscles, the bold proportions of the colossal gladiator which he is about to make. A thousand other objects worthy of being described were here to be seen, of which I might speak were it my wish to depict the curious domes, the numerous halls or picturesque avenues which the guide showed us, giving them names either well or ill applied. Thus the Devil's Forge was shown by the side of Hercules' and Pompey's Pillars, the Parapet of Napoleon was next to Vulcan's arm chair; Lot's wife constituted the pendant of an elephant's head. But a serious study may become in a manner a puerile and ridiculous amusement. Our guide was astonished that we preferred to the examination of these curiosities, a draught of the water of a sulphurous fountain which flows in their midst. This surprise was redoubled when he saw me take a flask from my pocket and fill it with this water which I intended to analyze. Alas! the flask was afterwards broken, and I am yet ignorant whether or not this fountain has properties distinct from the other sulphurous springs which are very abundant in Kentucky. We had entered the cavern at four o'clock in the afternoon; it was twilight when we left it. The next day, before the sun had yet appeared in the east, we descended again into the grotto, and without stopping at the curiosities in detail, we directed our steps towards the river whose course we proposed to examine.

Before reaching it we proceeded about four miles, sometimes over the rock itself or heaped stones which had fallen from the vault above, sometimes over fine sand, filled with pebbles. In many places, especially in the "Labyrinth," near "Gorin's dome," agates, chalcedons, and opals are found, which are for the most part common and of little value; but future researches may probably produce more valuable results. During our excursion, one of the negroes found a stone of the size of a pigeon's egg, and gave it to a Maryland lady who was of our party. I could not at that moment assure myself of its nature, but judging from external appearances I should have taken it for one of the most beautiful white opals I had ever seen. Before arriving at the river we passed over the gulf called the "Bottomless Pit." Two years ago this was the termination of all excursions; an abyss, which was believed to be fathomless, presented itself in the only path of the cavern. The distant noise of the waters of the river, which, repeated by the echoes of the cavern, resembles the dull roaring of a cascade,—the sight of the disordered piles of rocks, the sudden contraction which causes the arch above to descend nearly to the pathway, all conspired to produce the fear that death would be the consequence of another step. But one traveller more daring than his predecessors, took a watch which showed the seconds, seated himself on the brink of the abyss, threw into it a stone, and observed that after having rebounded against the sides of the gulf it finally stopped producing a noise louder than that which had preceded. The calculation, after many trials gave him an approximate depth of one hundred and forty feet English. From the peculiar sound of the waters, he judged, besides, that beyond this precipice he should find, notwithstanding the momentary contraction of the cavern, other vaults and other avenues, larger, perhaps, than any he had yet seen. Arming himself then with courage, he threw a ladder transversely over the mouth of the gulf and clung to it with his feet and hands. A single negro accompanied him, and struck with a superstitious horror, solemnly announced to him that he would perish. The prediction had almost proved true; the ladder, which was scarcely long enough, was but slightly supported at its opposite extremity, and at the moment when the adventurer thought to touch the other side, it slipped. The negro uttered a cry of terror, imagining that the hydra of the abyss had punished the white man for his audacious sacrilege; but the intrepid traveller, at the moment of the greatest danger, preserved all his presence of mind. While falling he reached out his hand, seized a point of the rock which happily did not give away, and not yet intimidated, soon found himself at the entrance of a new cavern. The negro, emboldened by the unexpected success of so rash an attempt, went to procure a longer ladder, passed in the same manner as the white man had done, and returned with him by the same route, after having seen the banks of the subterranean river towards which we were now directing our steps. It is scarcely necessary to say that at present a bridge of wood, thrown across the gulf, offers to visiters every facility for passing without danger, and every one is now astonished that such a trifle had proved a barrier so long.

It is undoubtedly surprising to find a river so far from day-light; it is wonderful to see a shadowy valley in the bosom of the earth, surrounded by hills, passes, and ravines, peopled with living beings, presenting with the exception of light all the characteristics of those valleys where we often love to wander. After having descended a little hill covered with sand and scattered rocks we found ourselves upon the borders of a new Styx. The river may be at this point about twenty feet wide; it is probably as much in depth. It runs over a bed of fine sand and pretty pebbles. Where it becomes shallower, and its banks are covered only to the depth of a few inches with water, a great number of craw-fish are found, generally small, stunted, and entirely white; they are sometimes, however, of the ordinary size, nearly black, and fatter than the other variety. The most striking characteristic of the two species, is the absence of eyes, owing, undoubtedly, to the total in-

utility of these organs. The fish which people the subterranean river, are also completely blind. But one kind has been discovered. It is of the genus cottus. The largest ever caught were about six inches long; their ordinary size is from three to four inches. It would be easy to procure living specimens, for I have seen them after having been wrapped in brown paper and kept in the pocket for half a day, still breathe, when, after arriving at the hotel, they were plunged into a basin of fresh water. It is certain that externally one cannot perceive in them any appearance of the organs of sight, and it is said that a physician of Louisville, after having anatomized many, was convinced of the entire absence of all the visual apparatus.

I ought to say a word here of many circumstances which cannot but be interesting to the physician and the naturalist. The exact vertical depth of the cavern has never been carefully observed: unfortunately I had not then with me, Mr. Bunter's excellent barometer, which I have since received from Europe, but I imagine that the mean level is not much below that of exterior valleys. If we sometimes descended hills, we as often climed others equally elevated. I do not even believe that the depth which is ordinarily requisite for a uniform temperature, is here necessary. This phenomenon already indicated as one of the characteristic traits of the Mammoth cave is probably owing to the difficulty which must exist in renewing the air; at the mouth of the cave, it is true, there is a current during the summer which ceases in winter; but is not a current which is felt at the entrance only, and which lasts but a few months, more than insufficient to renew the air of a cavern which one may penetrate even six miles without finding a termination? To finish the list of animals which inhabit it, I must add to the fish and craw-fish, many species of insects, among others arachnides, phalangianæ, and crickets. Their limbs in general are slender and elongated, their skin is starred and whitish, and the organ of sight is wanting in all. The bats which are found in the two apartments next to the principal hall of the cavern should not be placed in the same category. But it is time to continue our route; a canoe waits for us upon the bank; let us hasten to enter it. It is a terrible thing thus to advance over an unknown river, which often flows between two banks of peaked rocks, sometimes engulfed in narrow grottoes where the traveller must stoop to avoid striking against the vault, and thence rolls its waters on desolate shores where the rocks thrown one upon another present the confusion of chaos. There were too many of us to enter all at once into the bark, so the ladies were first placed in it with their husbands. Each one, lamp in hand, was quietly seated; two negroes were the rowers. As for us, seated upon the bank we saw the skiff move majestically towards the obscure part of the gulf. While passing onwards the light of the lamps was reflected from the black and fretted rocks on the banks. The masses of shadow opposed to the light, the profound silence of these retreats, when no human voice breaks the stillness, contrasting, at the least noise, with the sonorous reverberation of one of the most beautiful echoes I have ever heard, surprise and powerfully excite the imagination, and after a thousand wonders this seems the most astonishing. Presently the little boat made a half turn to the right and was hidden behind an enormous promontory. A shudder of terror passed, I acknowledge, over my soul; but then by a spontaneous and sympathetic movement, we all commenced singing. The voices of the females were sweeter and more melancholy, those of the men more solemn and majestic, and nature offers here at little expense, a scene that the art of producing strong emotions would essay in vain to repeat. This first passage lasted scarcely ten minutes; the bark returned to take us, and we soon found ourselves re-united upon a bank of compact *calcaire*, beneath which the river loses itself in the sand as by enchantment.

The first passage may be avoided by creeping across the rocks to the summit of the high hills which border on the river; then one walks sometimes on the brink of a precipice, while one hundred feet below lies an immense valley of an elliptic form,

at the bottom of which a dull murmur is all that indicates the presence of the waters. Many times since I have wished to enjoy this terrible view. A false step would have precipitated me into the abyss, and I cannot even now recall without a shudder, the words of a guide, who, seeing me tottering before him, cried out to me, "be careful; if you slip, you will be in the Dead Sea;" the gulf which embraces this sublime amphitheatre of scattered rocks being thus called. After proceeding a few steps only, we again found the bed of the river and another skiff. This passage is shorter and less picturesque than the first. But after a second landing place, the river assumes a grand and frightful aspect; now its bed is contracted between rocks undermined by the waters, then it enlarges and spreads into a lake. I often traversed it and always with a renewed sentiment of terror. Never, however, were these emotions so lively as on the evening of the first day. The party of which I was one, determined to pass the night in the cavern; I left them to pursue their route, while I returned with a companion and a guide. The canoe in which we were to cross the river was scarcely large enough for three persons. Imagine two old planks nailed at right angles upon a third, and upon which an intrepid American was the first to adventure only fifteen days before, for the purpose of completely exploring this little sea of placid water. The negro, stooping forward, rowed us along, while we held our lamps advanced out of the skiff to shew him his course. The silence, the obscurity, the gigantic forms of the bank and of the arch above, all recalled the scenes described by the pagan poets, and seemed to give reality to the fables of Acheron and the Styx—of the old pilot and his bark. This third passage occupies at least twenty minutes. A bay detaches itself in this part, but it can be crossed a few steps further on, by leaping from one rock to another. One of our companions stated that he had some days before climbed the barrier of rocks under which the river disappears, and that he had found the same river and saw a great quantity of fish without eyes, larger in general, than those which we had hitherto observed. There are certainly important discoveries to be made in this direction, because the river must discharge itself somewhere. It is not probable that it enters into Green river, which flows about a mile from the cavern, nor into any other exterior stream. An exact chart of its course would doubtless present curious windings, and a complete description of the animals which people its waters and its banks would be of great interest to the natural historian. Many of our party would not dare to risk their lives in so frail a boat, and it cannot be denied that there is real danger. However as they wished to pass from the right to the left bank, they again climbed the chain of hills which border this side of the river also, and the only passage which then presented itself to them was a kind of low and narrow grotto whose dimensions continually diminished; it soon became no more than a hole about a foot and a half high, through which they were obliged to crawl for nearly ten minutes. At last they reached the opposite link of the chain, and again found the river, which had made a long circuit. A wag proposed to give this narrow passage, where they had wound along like snakes, the name of Snake Avenue. One of the most picturesque points of view which can be enjoyed is presented to the traveller from the top of this last chain of hills; all around calcareous incrustations are rapidly forming; nature here moulds columns, draperies, groups of rocks and statues in confusion. The tops of these hills touch the vault, which in this part is pierced with excavations and adorned with great quantities of calcareous festoons. Below rolls the subterranean river into which one can throw himself by a single leap. At this point we leave the river to see it no more until our return, and enter into a new avenue whose dimensions are all as grand as those of the entrance. We then proceed over a damp sand, descend slippery hills, and climb others with the assistance of our hands and feet, till at length the soil becomes more dry, the noise of the waters is hushed in the distance, and a new world com-

mences. At first it is like a terrible chaos: we must walk over piles of scattered rock which have evidently fallen from the vault; others are suspended fifty, eighty, and one hundred feet above us, one only of which would crush four men. Sometimes the piles are so prodigious that at a distance they resemble hills; the passage is obstructed with them. We proceed thus more than three miles in the midst of the most complete disorder. The path at length becomes clearer, the ground is less strewn with wrecks, the walls are gradually reclothed with incrustations of gypsum, while the vault is festooned with crystallizations, in perfect preservation, and sometimes glittering. To the principal branch of the cavern other smaller caves are attached, which diverge in many directions. If one ventures into them he often finds brilliant chambers or graceful boudoirs hung with a beautiful white, thick, and smooth drapery. I have never heard that recent formations of gypsum more beautiful had been found elsewhere. This is but the antechamber of an immense palace. Five miles beyond the river is its singular entrance. Those who read this account will scarcely believe me, though I am very far from relating all that I felt or saw. The subterranean gallery in which we had heretofore walked at length terminates—the path then becomes narrower, and we gradually ascend until we are stopped by a wall, black as basalt. But this is only the commencement of marvels. We looked upwards and saw a hollow festooned with calcareous incrustations; they are like bunches of grapes in graceful clusters. By the aid of our feet and hands we ascended to it, although with difficulty, and the most magical spectacle was presented to our astonished gaze. We moved over garlands and heaps of black and white grapes. Masses of this beautiful fruit rested on the earth which was strewn with them. A pure stream which one might imagine to be their juice, flows along the garlands, follows the contour of their draperies, and finally falls drop by drop into a basin of carved rock. Alas! in a few years this magnificent hall will exist no more. It was discovered but fifteen days ago, and already I saw the brutal marks of the first strokes given to the beautiful garlands. This superb play of nature will soon become what the Gothic avenue now is, wrecks clothed with a beautiful name. It is at present called Cleveland's Cabinet. It is the entrance of a new cavern which is yet far from being entirely explored. The ground is covered with a fine dust of plaster produced from the decomposition of the gypsum incrustations: the walls are every where covered with them. They not only present the forms of columns and draperies, but also of leaves, flowers, rosettes, stars, and a thousand fanciful, natural, and graceful images. As we were at a distance of six miles from the entrance of the cavern, we did not wish to go further. Another world still remains to be discovered. Who knows if by galleries as yet unknown, another branch of the river may not yet be found? Who can tell all that is concealed for science and curiosity in this marvellous kingdom of shadows?

CATHOLIC MELODIES.

NO. II.

AS God when he had created our first parents, from whom the rest of mankind were to descend and to form the great family by which the earth was to be peopled, "blessed them, saying: increase and multiply, and fill the earth:" so did the Son of God, when he had come to regenerate the fallen posterity of Adam, and gathered around him a band of apostles, impart to his Church a principle of fruitfulness, by which it was to expand and diffuse itself over the whole world. "Go ye, therefore,

and teach *all nations*, . . lo! I am with you *all days*, to the consummation of the world." The history of the Church of Christ is but a verification of his promise. From the city of Jerusalem, where the mustard-seed of truth was originally sown, it was disseminated in every direction, and has now reached almost every part of the earth, exhibiting in the universality of its diffusion, of its duration, and of its doctrine, one of the bright characteristics by which the true Church will always be easily distinguishable from the numerous offspring of error. The Church of Christ, according to his words, which will not pass away, was to exist in all ages: every sect, therefore, that has sprung into existence subsequently to the apostolic times, is by that very criterion ascertained to be heterodox. The universality of the Church in respect of place is to be understood in a limited sense, because there never was a period when her communion was so universal, as not to exclude from its pale heretical sects and heathen nations. Yet in the scriptures she is called the Church of all nations, and St. Paul applies to the apostles those words of the Psalmist, "their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the end of the earth." The Church of Christ is therefore called *Catholic* or universal: 1. Because she has been at all times since the days of the apostles, the Church of many nations. 2. Because she forms the great body of Christians, from which others have withdrawn themselves. From these observations it follows that the title of *Catholic* is applicable only to that Church which can trace its existence to the apostolic age, and has always constituted the mass of the Christian people, or in other words to the Church in communion with the see of Rome. The members of this communion alone, all the attempts of modern sectarianism notwithstanding, can say with truth and consistency, *I believe in the Holy Catholic Church.* This article of our faith, as far it implies the universal diffusion of the Church, is beautifully developed in the following lines of our gifted correspondent. Ed.

THE UNIVERSALITY OF THE CHURCH.

"The children of the faith have built their altars on the lofty hills and in the shade of the valleys; the 'uttermost parts of the earth' have heard her lessons of salvation, and her creed is repeated in every variety of language."

Hail, universal power! whose name,
To every tongue is known;
Whose sacred symbol, still the same,
In every land is shown;
Whose conquests greet the traveller's eye,
Where'er he roams beneath the sky.

Church of the living God! to thee,
What myriad altars blaze,—
On isles that gem the frozen sea
Where Borealis plays,
'Mid burning Afric's pathless way,
And on the plains of Paraguay!

Siberia's snow clad steeps are cheered
By thy far reaching beams,
And high thy beacon fires are reared
To light old Ganges' streams;
Tartar, and Copt, and Chinese come
Alike to thee the heart's true home!

The dark-eyed Syrian opes to thee
His clouded soul in prayer,
And fair Armenians bend the knee,
Thy promised boon to share;
And e'en Numidia's daughters twine
Their humble wreaths to deck thy shrine.

The Spanish girl devoutly kneels,
Where springs the fretted dome;
And as the solemn organ peals
Each note strikes deeply home,
And to her high, impassioned soul,
Thy hallowed truths sublimely roll.

Where classic Rome's Colliseum stood,
And martyred Christians died,
While cameleopards, wild with blood,
To heathen shouts replied,
Thine altars now triumphant rise,
And Christian anthems mount the skies.

And lo! on Erin's verdant shore,
Her faithful maids are seen,
To make thy sign their shamrock o'er,
And bless its leaflets green;
While in communion still with thee,
Their thoughts to God rise pure and free.

E'en 'midst the red man's hunting grounds
Thine altar fires are lit,
And, like another Xavier's, sounds
The voice of good De Smedt,
Who from the Rocky Mountains' heights
Has answered now Saint Bernard's lights.

In every clime, in every tongue,
Thy triumphs may be traced,—
Painting has shown and music sung,
And poetry has placed,
Bright off'rings on thy shrine, and given
Their proudest efforts thus to heaven.

Genius, and art, and science,—each
Thy saving truths has caught;—
Truths,—to the wise that wisdom teach!
And to the thoughtful,—thought!
And low, in faith's equality,
Bondsman and master bow to thee.

Hail, holy power! From tent to throne,
Thy changeless creed proclaim!
The blinded heart in every zone,
With love divine inflame!
And speed the peaceful hour foretold,
When gath'ring nations seek thy fold!

St. Louis, Mo. Moïna.

From the U. S. Catholic Miscellany.

THOUGHTS ON THE ANGLICAN CHURCH.

CAN THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH BE CALLED CATHOLIC?

MORE than once, my dear ——, you have called my attention to the peculiar phraseology lately adopted by some of our friends of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in speaking of themselves as "the Catholics," while they affect to call us "Romanists;" and a few days since you also put into my hands, as having a bearing on this subject, a pamphlet which they profess to hold in high admiration, entitled "Catholic Truths and Roman Fallacies." My views upon these matters I have expressed to you fully in conversation; but for the purpose of enabling you to consider them more thoroughly you request that I would commit them, or at least the substance of them, to writing. With this request I feel a duty to comply.

In the beginning of the sixteenth century it may be said that there was but one visible church in the civilized world. The Greek division of Christians was not to be found out of the Russian and Turkish dominions. In Asia there were scattered Armenian, Nestorian, and Eutychian Christians; in the south of Europe there was a small sect called Waldenses, and in England there yet remained some of the followers of Wickliffe, or of the sect called Lollards. But the great body of Christendom was thoroughly united in the profession of the same faith, in the administration of the same sacraments, and in the observance of the same rites, and all acknowledged the same form of church government, over which presided, as the visible head on earth, the bishop of Rome. In the year 1517, was published in Witzenburg, in Germany, a book written by Martin Luther, containing ninety-five short theses on the nature of indulgences, and the errors of the questors, that is to say, of the persons employed to dispose of indulgences. This book gave rise to angry disputations, and the combatants becoming excessively heated, the dispute extended itself to other topics connected with religion, and doctrines were then broached on the part of Luther avowedly new, but alleged to be founded on the true interpretation of the scriptures. The consequence was a severance from the main body of a considerable portion who at first called themselves Gospellers and Reformers, but who afterwards, however, split amongst themselves into different subdivisions, under different appellations, took the distinctive name of "Protestants." The main body retained the ancient name of Catholics.

For some time after these dissensions, the Protestant doctrines made little progress in England. Indeed the English king (Henry VIII) entered into the controversy as a champion of the ancient faith against Luther, and obtained from the Pope, in acknowledgment of his Catholic ardor and zeal, the title of "Defender of the Faith," a title still claimed by the English monarchs. But a violent quarrel took place afterwards between the king and the Pope, because of the refusal of the latter to sanction Henry's divorce from his queen Catharine, and Henry contrived to obtain in 1531, from the convocation of the English clergy, an acknowledgment that he was "the chief protector, the only and supreme lord, and *as far as Christ would allow*, the supreme head of the Church." This submission of the English church to the king's dominion was afterwards, and without any regard to the remarkable qualification with which it was accompanied, treated as absolute, unconditional, and complete. On the third of November, 1534, by an act of parliament, (*Stat.* 26, *Hen.* VIII, *ch.* i) it was enacted and declared "that the king, our sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall be taken, accepted, and re-

ported the only supreme head on earth of the Church of England, called *Anglicana Ecclesia*, and shall have and enjoy, annexed and united to the imperial crown of this realm, as well the title and style thereof, as all honors, dignities, pre-eminences, jurisdictions, privileges, authorities, immunities, profits, and commodities to the said dignity of supreme head of the same church belonging and appertaining; and that our said sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, shall have *full power* and authority from *time to time* to visit, repress, reform, order, restrain, and amend all such *errors, heresies, abuses*, offences, contempts, and enormities, whatever they be, which by *any manner* of spiritual authority or jurisdiction, might or may lawfully be reformed, repressed, corrected, restrained, or amended, most to the pleasure of Almighty God, the increase of virtue in Christ's kingdom, and for the conservation of the peace, unity, and tranquillity of this realm, any usage, custom, foreign law, foreign authority, prescription, or *any thing* or *things* to the contrary notwithstanding." By this statute "the Church of England" was necessarily severed from all other Christian churches, and converted to all intents and purposes into a political establishment—its faith, its rites, its discipline, were surrendered to the dominion of the king. He was authorized from time to time to define and to decide what was true doctrine, and what heresy or error—to correct and reform as his judgeship or caprice should dictate whatever might be deemed abuses—to exercise every and "*any manner* of spiritual authority and jurisdiction"—any thing whether in Christ's law, or any where else to the contrary notwithstanding. The church was impiously given to Cæsar. It was not expected, nor intended, that any persons other than British subjects, should be affected by this delegation of ecclesiastical power. The objects of the statute were first to make the Church of England a separate and distinct establishment from the great Church of Christendom, and secondly, to subject this separate establishment to the absolute rule of the English monarch.

Upon the doctrinal points which had severed the Protestants from the Catholic world, the king took part against the Protestant teachers, and he caused many who espoused and preached their doctrines, to be put to death as impious heretics. In May, 1539, he caused to be enacted the statute "for abolishing diversity of opinions in certain articles concerning Christian religion," the statute commonly known as the statute of the six articles (*Stat.* 31, *Hen.* VIII, *ch.* xiv), in which the Catholic doctrine respecting the real presence in the eucharist, the Catholic discipline of receiving the sacrament under one form, the celibacy of the clergy, and the sanctity of vows of chastity, the celebration of the mass, and the practice of special or auricular confession, are all sanctioned as parts of the faith or discipline of "the Church of England," and severe punishments denounced against all who shall dare to gainsay them. Afterwards, while Henry lived, the book put forth by his authority, under the title of "A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for a Christian Man," but more usually styled "The King's Book," was the standard of orthodox faith in England.

Henry died in 1546, and the crown, and with it, as an inseparable appendage, the supreme dominion of the English Church, descended to Edward his son, then a child of nine years of age. His uncle Somerset, who acted as protector of the realm, and guardian of the infant king, was attached to the Protestant doctrines. Under his influence, and that of his associates, a liturgy for the use of the English church was established by act of parliament in January, 1548, (*Stat.* 2 *and* 3, *Edward* VI, *ch.* i) called "The Book of the Common Prayer, and administration of the sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the church after the use of the Church of England," and it was ordained that all ministers of the church within the realm, should use the same, and no other in this divine service. The changes in this book from the ancient liturgy, conformed in many respects to the views of the reformers. In 1552, in the name and by the authority of the young king, *this* book was reformed, amended, and explained, and by act of parliament (*Stat.* 5 *and* 6, *Edw.* VI, *ch.* i) the new book of

Common Prayer, and the administration of the sacraments, was commanded to be "accepted, received, used, and esteemed, in like sort and manner," and with the same penalties as had been enacted with respect to that established four years before, and which was now superseded. In the same year, by the authority of the king, was published "A Collection of the Articles of Religion," forty-two in number, which had been compiled by Archbishop Cranmer, then laid before a committee of bishops and divines, and after approval by them, sanctioned by the king. Edward died in 1553, at the age of sixteen years, and at the time of his death, this book of the forty-two articles was the standard of English orthodoxy.

Mary, who ascended the throne in July, 1553, was a Catholic, and in less than six months after she began to reign by act of Parliament, (*Stat.* 1, *Mary, Session* ii), *all* the statutes on the subject of religion passed since the death of her father, were repealed, the first and second book of the "Common Prayer," were prohibited to be used, and in lieu thereof it was enacted that such forms of divine worship and administration of the sacraments should be received and practised as had commonly been used in the last year of the reign of Henry the Eighth. In the next year all the articles and provisions of every kind, made in his reign for severing the Church of England from the See of Rome, were repealed, and the Church of England was re-admitted into the unity and bosom of the great Christian Church (See *Stat.* 1 *and* 2, *Phil. and Mary, ch.* viii). This was the state of religion in England, when Mary died in November, 1558.

Elizabeth, her successor, either hesitated or affected to hesitate between the Catholic and the Protestant religions. This, however, did not continue long, for in February, 1559, by *Stat.* 1, *Eliz., ch.* i, all the laws made in the preceding reign on the subject of religion, were repealed, and those in the reign of Henry the VIII, and Edward the VI, were re-enacted, and it was required that all bishops, ministers, &c., should take an oath "that the Queen's Highness is the *only* supreme governor of this realm, as well *in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes* as temporal; and by the second chapter of the same statute, the book of Common Prayer is again modified and commanded to be used in all the churches and chapels throughout the kingdom, and every person was bound on Sundays and holidays to attend during the time of common prayer, preaching, or other service of God there to be used and ministered. *All* the bishops but one—and a large portion of the clergy refused to take this oath, and for that cause all who refused were ejected from office, and others more compliant, were, by royal authority, appointed in their stead. The power of parliament was then resorted to in order to cure all defects and irregularities in this violent course, and by *Stat.* 8, *Elizabeth, ch.* i, the substituted bishops were declared to be bishops rightfully made, any statute, law, canon, or *other thing* to the contrary, notwithstanding. In January, 1562, the forty-two articles of religion, established under Edward, were revised and amended, and what have since been termed the thirty-nine articles, were promulgated in lieu of them, as the creed for the nation. Thus—and by the authority of the king and of the parliament, was ultimately fashioned, "The Church of England, as by law established," and this is its proper style and and title as given to it by its authors.

With the exception of the New England colonies, "the Church of England, as by law established," was upheld by law in all the English colleges and plantations on this side of the Atlantic. The king was its supreme head, and under him the government of it was vested in its archbishops, bishops, and priests, and the American colonies were for all ecclesiastical purposes declared to be a part of the diocess of the Bishop of London. The church was an integral part and parcel of the state, and when the dominion of England and of the English king was thrown off, the church also fell with it. It ceased to have existence here. But many of those who had been accustomed to the worship and rites observed in the Church of England, felt a natural attachment thereto. Under the influence of this attachment, a convention was held of certain clerical and lay delegates from dif-

ferent congregations, and a plan of religious union agreed upon, whereby they associated under the name of "The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States." This name, they themselves chose, and by this, in their prayer books and in their public acts they have ever since been designated.

Recently there have been extraordinary movements among some of the most pious and learned of the Church of England on the subject of religion. Believing that in the innovations on the ancient faith, and still more in the changes from the ancient rites, ceremonies, and observances, their predecessors, in many instances, instead of reforming errors and correcting abuses, had perverted the truth, and weakened almost unto death the spirit of devotion, they have zealously and industriously sought to restore what they believed had been rashly if not impiously taken away. In the course of their animated discussions some of them have *protested* against the name of "Protestant," as a term significant of nothing but dissent, or opposition, or separation, and claimed to be called English Catholics, as being a branch of the great Catholic Church. These agitations and discussions have reached this shore of the Atlantic, and several among "the Protestant Episcopalians of the United States," following this example, now set up their title to the name of "Catholic" also.

These pretensions or claims are of very modern date. True, both in the English and American Churches, the ancient formularies of the Apostles' and Nicene creeds, were recited in divine worship, wherein a faith is solemnly professed in "The Holy Catholic Church," but without being able to ascertain what precise idea was supposed to be expressed thereby, I hazard nothing in asserting that *in pais*, out of the church, no member of either, until within a few years back, called himself or his Church Catholic. All of them gloried in the appellation of "Protestant," and the term Catholic was exclusively applied as the more respectful designation of the Church which they were accustomed to deride by the nickname of "Popish."

The professors of the ancient faith have certainly no cause to regret this new-born zeal for the name of Catholic. Names are by no means unimportant. The attachment now avowed for the appellation of Catholic, and the solicitude on the part of these, our separated brethren, to appropriate it to themselves, may be, and probably is, in the order of God's providence, one of the means to bring them back to the Catholic faith. But while we do not regret that the claim is preferred, they ought not to be surprised that we cannot admit it to be well founded.

The word Catholic has a precise and undisputed signification. It means "universal," or "general." Is there any ground upon which "The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States" can claim to be the universal or general Church of Christendom? Their numbers are understood to range between six and eight hundred thousand, while the whole Christian population far exceeds two hundred millions. As compared with the Christian body they do not constitute one in three hundred. But they do not assert this claim in behalf of themselves exclusively, but insist that they constitute one Church with the Church of England. Now is this the fact? That there is a near affinity, a striking family resemblance between the two Churches, is not to be disputed, but it seems impossible to maintain that they two make but one Church. In so grave a concern as that of religion, care should be taken not to confound similarity with identity, and *there*, emphatically, the rule applies that no *like* is the *same*. Do the two Churches profess the *same faith?* There is one essential and marked difference in their professions of religious belief. It is a fundamental—indeed the very primary principle of the English Church that the supreme power is of right in the king, his heirs and successors. It belongs to his indisputable rights to reform, repress, and correct errors, heresies, and abuses in the Church, as fully as they can be reformed, repressed or corrected by any manner of spiritual jurisdiction or authority—that is to say, to remodel the creed, to regulate the administration of the sacraments, to prescribe the forms of public

worship, and to control the conduct of its teachers in all spiritual matters. This is, indeed, sometimes complained of as an usurpation of the crown, but has it not been submitted to by the Church of England, and is it not embodied into the creed of that Church? The thirty-seventh article of religion, as contained in the book of Common Prayer, declares that unto the king's majesty the chief government of all the estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in *all causes* doth appertain," and the only explanation or even seeming qualification of this acknowledgment of dominion over the ecclesiastical estate in *all causes*, is, "that the *ministering* of God's word or of the sacraments is not given to the *princes*." We have seen in what sense the supreme power over the Church was asserted by Parliament, and the oath acknowledging that supreme power in the king required to be taken, and this article must be understood, so far as it does not contravene or qualify this claim thus avowed, and thus enforced by oath, as an explicit sanction and recognition of it. What is the creed of "The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States," on this very important article? Far from adopting, it expressly repudiates the *principle* therein asserted. The thirty-seventh article in the American book of Common Prayer declares "that the power of the civil magistrate extendeth to *all* men, as well clergy as laity, in all things temporal, but *hath no authority in things purely spiritual*." The question is not which of these be right—but whether the Church which holds as an article of religion that the civil magistrate hath supreme power in all causes, as well spiritual as temporal, can be the same with that Church which holds as an article of religion that the civil magistrates have no authority in spiritual causes?

In the eighth article of the English confession of faith it is declared that "the three creeds, Nicene creed, Athanasius' creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by most certain warrants of scripture." But the eighth article of the American Episcopal confession, evidently copied therefrom, purposely omits the Athanasian creed. It declares that "the Nicene creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for *they* may be proved by most certain warrants of scripture." One, therefore, of the symbols of faith in the English Church—one which it declares ought *thoroughly* to be received and believed is wholly thrown aside by the American Church.

In the catechism, contained in the English book of Common Prayer, the doctrine of the Church with respect to the Lord's supper is laid down in the form of questions and answers thus: "*Question.* What is the outward part or sign of the Lord's supper? *Answer.* Bread and wine which the Lord hath commanded to be received. *Question.* What is the inward part or thing signified? *Answer.* The body and blood of Christ, which are *verily and indeed* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper." In the catechism contained in the American book of Common Prayer, the answer to the first question is the same, but the answer to the second and only important question, most materially modifies the doctrine, thus: "*Answer.* The body and blood of Christ, which are *spiritually* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper."

There is an essential difference in the rites commanded to be observed. In the English book of Common Prayer it is directed in the visitation of the sick as follows: "Here shall the sick person be moved to make a *special* confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession the priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this sort. Our Lord Jesus Christ who hath left power to his Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thy offences, and by *his authority committed to me I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen!*" In the American book of Common Prayer, there is to be found no injunction for a special confession of sins, and no absolution directed to be pronounced as of

authority. We believe, indeed, that such a confession and such an absolution would be *generally* regarded by them as superstitious, if not impious observances.

In the forms of church government there is a very great difference. In England there is an established hierarchy of king, archbishops, bishops, and ministers, and in ecclesiastical matters there is a regular order of appeals from the lowest to the highest jurisdiction. In this country the Episcopalians have (it is believed) no common supreme ecclesiastical tribunal. They have no visible head of the church, and no archbishops; and the bishop of each diocess is the highest tribunal for that diocess.

Before the reformation, or religious revolution in England, the legislative authority in all ecclesiastical matters belonged, subject to the approbation of the Holy See, to the clergy of the realm, that is, to the archbishops, bishops, and priests in convocation assembled. For some years after the reformation, such convocations were in fact assembled. But by *Statute 25, Henry 8, ch.* xix. it was enacted that the convocation should not make or execute any canons or ordinances without His Majesty's license, and assent to make and execute the same, and that the king should have power to appoint thirty-two commissioners, of whom half should be clergymen, and half of the *upper or lower house of parliament*, and these were empowered to abrogate and frustrate such of the existing canons and ordinances as they by his assent should deem proper. By this and subsequent statutes the authority of the convocation was so effectually transferred to the crown, that the convocation itself became wholly impotent and useless, and for more than a century has never transacted any business. The last which did act was in the year 1717, in the reign of George I, when the proceedings turned chiefly upon two publications of Bishop Hoadley, the one entitled, "a preservative against the principles and practices of the non-jurors," and the other a sermon "on the nature of the kingdom of Christ." While the convocation was engaged in discussing the report of a committee censuring these publications as "tending to impeach the royal supremacy in causes ecclesiastical, and the authority of the legislature to enforce obedience in matters of religion by civil sanctions," the discussion was silenced by a royal prerogative, and those ecclesiastical synods for all practical purposes have since ceased to exist. In the United States, according to the discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the legislative authority over all ecclesiastical matters, is exercised in each diocess by a diocesan synod or convention, constituted of the bishop, the clergy, and certain lay delegates of the respective congregations of that diocess. A convention is also held, which is called national, consisting of the bishops, clergy, and lay delegates from the different diocesses, but its authority is understood to be consultatory or recommendatory merely. Its decrees or decisions do not bind *per se*, but bind only through the sanction of the conventions of the several diocesses.

But if the Church of England, and the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States could be regarded as constituting but *one church*—what would be their united claim to be termed the Catholic Church of Christendom? The former is exclusively confined to the subjects of Great Britain, and the latter comprehends only American citizens. Neither is in communion with the church of any other country. It cannot be stated with precision, what is the number of persons who belong, or claim to belong to them, but it may be sufficiently ascertained, for the purpose of testing their right to this distinctive appellation. The population of England and Wales, according to the latest statistical accounts that have fallen into my hands, was stated at about sixteen millions. In a report of the British Reformation Society held at London in 1838, it was set forth that upwards of one million of Catholics were to be found in England. They probably at this time do not much fall short of two millions. But take them as being one million, there remain fifteen millions to be divided among all other religious societies. Now if we consider the very many in England who pretend to no faith—the avowed Deists,

the Jews—also the Presbyterians, Independents, Methodists, Baptists, Anabaptists, Socinians, Unitarians, Universalists, the Quakers or Friends, and the hundreds of other sects which call themselves Christians—I am confident that it would be a very liberal allowance to say that half of these fifteen millions either really or nominally belong to the church as by law established. Add to these seven and a half millions, seven hundred thousand for Ireland and Scotland, four hundred or six hundred thousand more in the English colonies, and say seven hundred thousand Episcopalians in this country, and you have a sum total a little exceeding nine millions in the world. This does not equal the number of Catholics in the British dominions and the United States *alone*. There are at least eight millions of them in Ireland, England, and Scotland—(probably indeed nine)—it is admitted that there are a million three hundred thousand in the United States—there must be nearly a million in the Canadas, and other British colonies on this continent—making, after including the many thousands scattered throughout the West Indies, and the Eastern English colonies, at least ten millions and a half. Now, if to these we add one hundred and forty millions—or say only one hundred millions, existing in the other regions of the world—and consider this vast number, consisting of all tribes and tongues, yet *perfectly united* in religion—all professing the same doctrines, administering and receiving the same sacraments, and connected by the same spiritual ties, under one common visible and acknowledged head—which has the better right to call itself the Universal, the General, or the Catholic Church of Christendom?

It has, however, been insisted of late, that although the Anglican Church, or the Protestant Episcopal Church of this country, cannot either separated or confederated, take to itself the *exclusive* title of "The Catholic Church;" yet it can claim to be regarded as a branch of the Catholic Church, and "the Romanists," as they now affect to call us, may, notwithstanding their errors and corruptions, be acknowledged as another branch of the same Church. Alas! alas! what species of figurative tree of religion is this, which consists altogether of branches, and has no common stock or fruit? And what can be the idea of religious unity entertained by those who broach these vain notions! Certainly it is not an unity of faith—nor of sacraments—nor of rites—nor of spiritual government. Was this the unity contemplated by its Divine founder, when he characterized his Church as being "the *one* fold," under "*one* Shepherd?" If, indeed, *these* be all branches originally of one great tree, they are branches torn asunder, having no communion, circulation—no vitality, and fit only for the burning.

The Catholics, it is known, do not recognize the Church of England, or the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, as in communion with them.

As men, many of them excellent men, professing in part Christian doctrines, and observing Christian duties, we are bound to regard them, and take delight in regarding them with the kindest feelings of charity—but unquestionably they are not members of the same spiritual flock to which we belong. We believe them to have strayed away from the Catholic fold. And how is it for *all purposes*, except when our numbers are needed to help in making them out a part of the Catholic Church, how is it that these our separated brethren regard us? They both protest against us as a false and corrupt Church, which their consciences compelled them to quit. They both profess and declare as a fundamental article of religion (article 28th in both English and American books of Common Prayer), "that transubstantiation or the change of the substance of bread and wine in the supper of the Lord, is *repugnant to the plain words of scripture*, and overturneth the nature of a sacrament." They declare (article 22d), that our doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, and what they choose to call, the worshipping and adoration of images and relics, and the invocation of saints, is "a foul thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of scripture, but rather *repugnant to the word of God*." Both declare (article 31), that the

sacrifice of masses, the most solemn of all our rites, "are *blasphemous fables* and *dangerous deceits.*" The ungrammatical phraseology is that of the articles, not mine. They set forth (article 35), that certain homilies, and among them, is enumerated that "against peril of idolatry," contain godly and wholesome doctrine, "and therein is contained the dreadful denunciation, that for eight hundred years before the reformation, all ranks of Christendom, were sunk in idolatry!" They both deny the inspiration of a portion of what our Church reverences as the undoubted word of God, and though they allow the reading thereof, "for example of life and instruction of manners," yet they refuse to it any "authority for the establishment of doctrine." Every clergyman of the Church of England is obliged to subscribe to these thirty-nine articles before his ordination. Every bishop, peer, and member of parliament, until the late Catholic emancipation act, was obliged—and every bishop yet, and also every peer and member of parliament, except those who are styled "Roman Catholics," is obliged to subscribe a written declaration whereby he does "solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare that he does believe that in the sacrament of the Lord's supper *there is not* any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof, by any person whatever; and that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other saint, and the sacrifice of the mass, *as they are now used in the Church of Rome,* are superstitious and idolatrous, and that he makes this declaration in the plain and ordinary sense of the words as they are commonly understood by English Protestants." (*Stat.* 30, *Charles II. ch.* ii.) With these formal, solemn, and authentic declarations—that one of the most sacred articles of our faith is repugnant to the words of scripture and overturneth the nature of a sacrament—that our doctrine about an intermediate state after death, and invocation of saints, and showing respect to their images and relics, are foul things vainly invented, and repugnant to God's word—that the sacrifice of the mass is a blasphemous fable, superstitious and idolatrous—and with an express sanction of the doctrine of the Homilies, that we, for adhering to the religion, as it was held and practised in Christendom for ages before the reformation, are sunk in damnable idolatry—it is inconceivable that they should yet hold us to be a living branch of Christ's spiritual vine, a member of the *One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church,* founded by him, built upon a rock, against which the powers of darkness should never prevail, and with which the spirit of truth, concord, peace, and true godliness was to abide forever! Whoever may be right, the Catholic Church, the Church of England, and the Protestant Episcopal Church, cannot *all* be right. If those who believe what those solemn denunciations and affirmations declare that they believe—who in their consciences protest against our doctrines and our rites as superstitious, blasphemous, idolatrous and damnable—if *these* be the Catholics, unquestionably we cannot also be; and if on the other hand, we are the Catholics, they must remain, what until lately they took a pride in declaring themselves, Protestants. They have left us, because, as they say, of our errors, inventions, blasphemous fables, superstition and idolatry. And because of these they protest to God and the world against us. They are not of us or with us, but against us.

THE PRIESTHOOD IN THE CHURCH.

NO. II.

The Priesthood in the Church, set forth in two discourses. By William Rollinson Whittingham, bishop of Maryland. Second edition, with a preface and additional notes. Baltimore: Knight & Colburn.

IN our first article on the priesthood in the Church, it was shown that the rules of speech do not tolerate the assumption of a claim, on the part of the Protestant Episcopal clergy, to the appellation of priests, because words are merely conventional sounds for the expression of ideas, and the Protestant Episcopal clergy not being in the public opinion what is understood by the word *priest*, they are appropriately known under another designation. This should be sufficient to destroy all pretension to such a title among the reformed clergy, and to check the *usurping arrogance** of those who undertake the remodelling of our language and the perversion of ancient and venerated names, in order to pass off with better grace the innovations of modern times. Bishop Whittingham, in the second edition of his discourses, with a preface and additional notes, contends that "it is the thing, not the name, about which the true Catholic is anxious;" and further on he remarks; "against both the Romanist and such churchmen as may be disposed towards the view of Zuingle, it is safe and right to insist that while we have the thing, we (the Protestant Episcopal clergy) shall not tamely surrender its true name." Now we assert that the bishop has committed two great mistakes in the extracts which we have quoted. In the first place the true Catholic should not be free from anxiety with respect to the names that express his religious views. What a distortion of language would ensue, if ministers of the gospel who hold and preach doctrines diametrically opposite, employed the same terms to express the nature of their functions? What a confusion of tongues would be witnessed, if the words *priest, altar, sacrifice*, &c. were introduced among Christians to convey ideas that were never, in a proper sense, connected with these terms? We have not the slightest doubt that Bishop Whittingham has more than once smiled at the assumption of the episcopal title by men who deny that the episcopal order is a distinct grade of the Christian hierarchy, and he would probably admit that were this assumption to become general, it might have the effect of misleading the ignorant or unwary. At all events the regard for a proper and well defined terminology is not peculiar to the members of the Catholic priesthood; the Protestant clergy, as we have shown, are far from being willing to employ a language that does not accord with their religious opinions. Why did the Rev. Mr. Johns, on the day of his installation as rector of Christ church, protest so forcibly against the terms which his bishop had used in the morning? We give the reason in his own words: "I do firmly and solemnly believe that the use of such language cannot fail to bewilder and mislead the minds of our people. . . . . to use these terms without such qualification (of a figurative sense) very distinctly expressed, leads to error and is at variance with the word of God, and the institutions and principles of our Church."* Nor does the Rev. Mr. Johns rely solely upon his own judgment in the expression of this opinion; he adduces the authority of Bishop White, who has devoted a whole lecture to the exposition of the inconsistency and danger attending the use of the words *priest, altar*, &c. by those who believe with Bishop Whit-

* We use the expression of the bishop, p. 4.

* Protestant Episcopal Pastor, pp. 12, 14.

tingham* that the bread and wine of the eucharist are mere figures or types.

The second error which the bishop has committed, or rather repeated, in the republication of his discourses, is to assert that the Episcopalian Church possesses the ministry and worship which authorise the use of the phraseology objected to by Mr. Johns. It will be seen in the sequel of these remarks how gratuitously the pretension has been put forth. He rests his proposition on the ground that "the ministry of the Christian priesthood in the word and sacraments (as understood in the Protestant Episcopal Church) is equivalent in nature and efficiency to that of the Jewish priesthood in offering animal or other sacrifices."† But, even were this the case, the thesis of the bishop would not be proved: for there can be no true Christian priesthood, except among those who perform the functions instituted and delegated by our divine Saviour. Now one of the principal functions that are exercised by the ministers of Christ is to offer the sacrifice of his sacred body and blood, according to the doctrine of the Catholic Church which is clearly proposed in the following words of the council of Trent. "Although Christ our Lord was to offer himself once to his eternal Father on the altar of the cross by actually dying to obtain for us eternal redemption, yet as his priesthood was not to become extinct by his death, in order to leave his Church a visible sacrifice suited to the present condition of men, a sacrifice which might at the same time represent to us the bloody sacrifice consummated on the cross, preserve the memory of it to the end of the world, and apply the salutary fruits of it for the remission of the sins which we daily commit; at his last supper on the very night on which he was betrayed, giving proof that he was established a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech, he offered to God the Father his body and blood under the appearances of bread and wine, and under the same symbols gave them to the apostles, whom he constituted at the same time priests of the new law. By these words, 'Do ye this in remembrance of me,' he commissioned them and their successors in the priesthood to consecrate and offer his body and blood, as the Catholic Church has always understood and taught. For, after having celebrated the ancient passover which the children of Israel immolated in remembrance of their delivery from the bondage of Egypt, he established the new passover, giving himself to be immolated by his priests in the name of his Church under visible signs, in memory of his passage from this world to his Father; when, redeeming us by his blood, he delivered us from the power of darkness, and translated us into his kingdom." (*Sess.* 22, *c.* 1.) The bishop may quibble at his pleasure upon the words of the council, *visible, immolated*, &c., as well as those used in the canon of the mass and in the prayer books of the faithful;* all this will have no effect whatever in substantiating his claim to the true ministry of the gospel; because it will still be certain that he does not offer the sacrifice instituted by Christ, and consequently that his ministerial office is the mere phantom of the Christian priesthood; in short that in his communion there is not the real or true sacrifice of the new law which is the basis of the Christian priesthood, but a fictitious rite and human invention from which its minis-

* Emanuel in the Eucharist, pp. 10, 11. The bishop tells us that Bishop White was "warped by prejudice." The fact is that Bishop White had in view to call things by their right names, and to prevent the introduction among Protestants of a phraseology, which does not express their opinions. Bishop White, sustained as he is by general usage, could with much more propriety retort the charge, and say that Bishop Whittingham is warped by prejudice.

† Priesthood in the Church, second edition, p. 3. In placing the Christian ministrations on a level with the Jewish rites, the bishop pays no great homage to the dignity and efficacy of the sacrifice under the law of grace. The difference would be in favor of the Jewish dispensation, that offered to God the paschal lamb, beautifully typical of the LAMB who was to be slain for the sins of the world.

* According to Bishop Whittingham "the council of Trent says, the sacrifice of the Mass is Christ's body and blood slain under the transubstantiated signs. The canon of the mass and their own prayer books teach the people that it is the elements untransubstantiated." The council does not say this, as is evident from the text. The canon of the mass and the prayer books term the unconsecrated elements, *sacrifices*, but not in the strict and proper sense. Thus could we call upon the faithful to bring their *offerings* for the poor, though the objects which they are to present are not offerings strictly speaking, until they are given.

ters can derive no claim to the appellation of Christian priests.*

According to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, the body and blood of Christ are substantially present in the offering which is made to God. Is it not then an abuse of words to contend, as the bishop does, that the sacrifice in this hypothesis is *less real* than where the elements of the eucharist are mere signs of that body and blood? Which is, more properly speaking, the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ,—the offering in which they are truly and substantially present, or that in which they are truly and really absent? By confounding also a real and bloody immolation, such as that of the cross, with a real and unbloody immolation, as that which takes place in the eucharistic sacrifice, Bishop Whittingham strangely misunderstands the doctrine of the Catholic Church. For we believe that in the sacrifice of the new law, the body and blood of Christ are really and substantially present, and a visible immolation takes place, consisting in the apparent separation of the body from the blood under the species of bread and wine; an immolation effected by the sword of the consecrating word, and when, to the senses our Saviour appears in a state of death, and is offered to his Father under the symbols of death. This is the doctrine of the Church, which all Catholic theologians have ever taught, and the faithful have ever believed. It matters not what their opinions may be on other points which are not of faith; the one essential question is that which regards the reality of the sacrifice, and all are united in the belief contained in the words of the Tridentine synod, that the body and blood of Christ are substantially offered to God in an unbloody manner during the action of the mass:† all believe that the victim present is identically the same as that offered on the cross, and that the difference between the two sacrifices consists merely in the mode of offering, and that the mystic oblation on our altars is a renovation and perpetuation of that which took place in a bloody manner on Calvary, thus verifying the prediction of the Psalmist in relation to Christ: "Thou art a priest forever, according to the order of Melchisedech." To contend, therefore, that the sacrifice is *less real* than the Protestant eucharist, which contains mere bread and wine, is manifestly, to borrow an expression of Bishop Whittingham, *shuffling aside* from the truth. We shall now proceed to examine the explanations which he has furnished of the contradictions pointed out in the two discourses.

1. One of the inconsistencies charged against the bishop was in relation to the following passage of St. James' epistle. "Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil," &c. He concludes from this text that the elders of the Church have power for the forgiveness of sins; but knowing that among the elders of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the ceremony of praying over a sick person and anointing him with oil is not practised, we put the question: "if Christ conferred this power for the benefit of his people, why do Protestant ministers withhold the blessings that may flow from it?" To this inquiry the bishop answers: "Such questions come with peculiarly ill grace from a member of a communion that professes to believe in the continuance of the gift of miracles to the Church, and retains the use of the outward sign once made the instrument of the gift of healing. When Protestants hear of the sick being 'raised up' by *extreme unction*, they may deem it right to restore the use of oil, in addition to the prayers which their priests *now* offer for the forgiveness of sins."

Now this is a mere evasion of the difficulty; because in the text of St. James that

* The proofs by which we intended to establish this proposition at length, are necessarily deferred to another article, that we may notice the additional observations of Bishop Whittingham in the second edition of his discourses.

† Bishop Whittingham has misrepresented the opinion of Bellarmine, in saying that he considered the consumption of the elements as the *immolation*. No such language is to be found in Bellarmine. He says that the consumption of the elements by the priest is an integral part of the sacrifice, not that it is the immolation. It would have been better to consult the works of Bellarmine, than to take his opinions at second hand from Bishop Moreton, who attributes to him words that he never wrote. See Bellar. De Missa, l. 1, c. 27. The N. York *Churchman* has observed with regret this error of Bishop Whittingham.

we have quoted, the benefits accruing to the sick person from the ministrations of the elder, are not attributed to his "prayers," any more than to the "anointing with oil;" the scriptural passage expressly enjoins upon the elders "to pray over the sick person, anointing him with oil;" the restoration of the patient's health is not stated to be the result of anointing; why then does the bishop speak of the gift of miracles, as if a miracle were implied by the unction, and the forgiveness of sins by the prayer? What right has he to suppose that the forgiveness of sins does not follow from the anointing as well as from the prayer? Upon what grounds also does he suppose that the Almighty may not, without any miracle, but in virtue of a holy rite by him established, restore the health of the sick person when he deems it expedient for his spiritual welfare? We are, therefore, still authorized to urge the question, and to demand from the bishop an explanation of the inconsistency in which he is involved. If our divine Saviour, by the teaching of his apostle instituted a ceremony, consisting of prayer and anointing with oil, and enjoins upon the ministers of his Church to perform this ceremony in behalf of the sick, why do not the ministers of the Protestant Episcopal Church conform to the command of Christ in this particular? Bishop Whittingham infers from the text of the apostle that our Saviour has left to the elders of the Church the power of forgiving sins; why then does he undertake to mangle the institution or the ceremony by which this forgiveness is to be obtained? The scripture tells us that this ceremony consists of an unction with oil and of prayer; why does the bishop omit the unction? We contend that he has no more authority to separate this anointing from the act of prayer, than he has to curtail the rite of baptism by omitting the ablution with water, while he pronounces the requisite formula.

2. We charged the bishop with having maintained that the Church of Christ before the reformation was characterized by a *half-discarded paganism* and an *almost blasphemous use* of the eucharistic institution. To show that we had reason for the assertion, we will quote his words at length.* "Unquestionably, like every other truth, this of the sacerdotal character of the Christian ministry, has been liable to misinterpretation and abuse. Errors of the most dangerous nature have grown out of it, and prevailed to a very great extent, and find their misguided advocates to this very day and at our thresholds. A priesthood assuming the character of mediatorship and intercessorship sprung up in days of predominant ignorance, out of the amalgamation of half discarded paganism with the Christian forms and doctrines. A worship offered not *with*, but *for* the people, in a tongue unknown to them, and a voice inaudible, crept into use among insufficiently instructed converts from the barbarous hordes that changed the face of Europe in the sixth and following centuries, and, in similar circumstances, found its way among the churches of the east, depriving their time-honored forms of half their beauty and nearly all their efficacy. Crude, contradictory, and low views of the Christian sacraments, led to utterly unscriptural notions of the sacrificial nature of the blessed eucharist, and while they, almost blasphemously, elevated it into a constantly recurring, and simultaneously multiplied, propitiatory repetition of the one great mystery wrought on Calvary; degraded it into dependence for its nature, worth and efficacy, on the intention of the frail and sinful men commissioned with its administration. Ministerial intervention for the remitting or retaining sin, by admission to the sacraments or exclusion from their privileges, assumed the form, for ten centuries unheard of in the Church, of judicial reconciliation of offenders in absolution, given on terms at the discretion of the fallible, mortal judge.

"Such a priesthood the reformers found, claiming privileges, which it refused to test by the written record of its commission, and exercising those privileges, even on its own showing of their extent, in abuses the most fearful and soul-destroying. Is it wonderful that some who set themselves to gainsay its usurpations, failed, in the corruption which

* Priesthood in the Church, first edition, p. 20, &c.

they saw, to find the simple, scriptural original? and under the exclusive worship, mumbled in an unknown tongue, of a mass and pardon-mongering ministry, lost sight of the Christian priesthood and its spiritual sacrifices?"

This is strong language applied to the Church; but how does the bishop rebut the charge that we preferred against him? He denies it: he tells us: "The Romanist critic of these Discourses has permitted himself to ask, with reference to this passage, 'How can it be said that this Church of Christ was characterized by a *half discarded paganism, an almost blasphemous* use of the eucharistic institution?' It is not so said, as the reader must perceive. It *is* said of 'half discarded paganism' that it was amalgamated with Christian forms and doctrines. Does that affirm that one ingredient of this amalgamation characterized the Church?" And, in order to illustrate the subject, he honors the Catholic Church with the following compliment: "Idolatry is amalgamated with the Tridentine doctrine of the eucharist, in the 'latria' paid to the 'sacrament' *as such*, which in as far as it *is a sacrament* is a creature: but shall it therefore be said that idolatry characterizes the Tridentine communion? Surely not: yet idolatry is more prominent in the heterogeneous mass now known as Romanism, than 'half discarded paganism' was in the Christianity of the eighth and ninth centuries." Now, we contend that the bishop by this flattering comparison has only confirmed the accusation that we lodged against him. If idolatry were amalgamated with our doctrine of the eucharist, it would be an *insufferable feature* of the Catholic worship; it would place us on a level with the heathens, and deprive us of all claim whatever to communion with the Church of Christ: and for the same reason, if *half-discarded paganism, crude, low views and unscriptural notions* of the eucharist were amalgamated with the Christianity of the eighth and ninth centuries, depriving its *time-honored forms* of *nearly all their efficacy*, and *blasphemously* modifying its divinely established institutions: if all this had crept into the Church of those days, it was certainly a *characteristic* which marked it as no longer the Church of Christ, with which he promised to abide to the end of the world: it was enough to exclude it from all claim to respect, as it did not understand the scriptures rightly, which, as Bishop Whittingham admits, can be rightly interpreted only in and by the Church.* Vainly will he reply that "the Church Catholic never sanctioned the views and practices spoken of in the text as 'crude, contradictory, low, almost blasphemous;'" and that "a few western bishops, assembled under the coercing influence of Rome, at Trent, by so doing, and pretending to a right which the Church Catholic alone can exercise, have cut themselves and their adherents off from its blessed body, *so far as their own act*, without the judicial sentence of a general council, *can effect it*." Let him name, if he can, any portion of the Christian world in which these practices were not sanctioned. Were they not sanctioned at Rome, and was not every nation in Christendom, except the eastern schismatics, in communion with the see of Rome before the reformation? Upon what historical grounds can he assert that the fathers of the council of Trent cut themselves off from the Church? From what church did they separate? From that of Luther, or Henry the Eighth's parliament? Will he contend that either of these individuals was the Church of Christ, or that the Christian body should have bowed to the will of Luther, a mere priest, or of a set of laymen in England?† If he say this, what becomes of the Church-authority which he recognizes? The facts which history proclaims are simply these, that when Luther broached his *new* opinions, he was condemned by the only ecclesiastical authority that existed, that of the Catholic Church, represented by the council of Trent. In the same way, when Henry VIII. denied the supremacy of the Pope, because the latter would not encourage his lustful designs, he was denounced as an innovator, by the same authority. Before this period, the whole Christian world, with the exception above mentioned, was united with the see of Rome, and

* Priesthood in the Church, 2d edit. p. 27, *note*.
† See Thoughts on the Anglican Church, p. 172.

therefore the dilemma in which Bishop Whittingham has placed himself, remains in full play against him, and we repeat the question, where was the Church of Christ, "the pillar and ground of truth," at the time when *low, contradictory, almost blasphemous practices* were prevalent, and *a half-discarded paganism* characterized its worship? How can all this be conciliated with the promises of Christ, to remain with his Church to the end of time?

3. We proved that Bishop Whittingham had incorrectly represented the Catholic worship, in the statement that it was offered "not *with*, but *for* the people." The words of the canon of the mass quoted by us are an evidence that the people do offer in conjunction with the priest: but to escape from the charge he says that we did not cite his words at length; we cited what we knew to be an error, and we exposed it. That this error moreover was the point to which the bishop directed particular attention, is plain from the italicism of the words. He seems to argue that, the sacrifice in the Catholic Church is not offered *with* the people, because the more solemn part of it is recited in an inaudible voice, and in an unknown tongue. But how such an inference could be drawn from the premises we are utterly at a loss to conceive. For if the people read the prayers in their books or mentally unite with the officiating clergyman, what prevents them from being co-offerers with him?*

4. In relation to the charge that Bishop Whittingham had stigmatized the Catholic priesthood in opprobrious terms, he remarks that he spoke of the *priesthood which the reformers found.* This observation may pass for what it is worth; every body knows that the priesthood which the reformers found, was the priesthood of the Catholic Church.* But he adds: "In many respects the reformation has been of great advantage to the priesthood even in the Tridentine schism: and the writer of these discourses would not choose to employ the language of the text, without qualification, of the priesthood in any part of the Roman obedience at the present day; still less, of that in the Roman schism in this country."† Are we to consider this a compliment, gentle reader? It cannot be denied that opposition on the one side is frequently productive of reaction on the other, and in the providence of God evil may become the occasion of good. By the efforts of the reformers, who set up their private opinions against the teachings of the universal Church, the vigilance both of the clergy and the laity was doubtless awakened, and they armed themselves more vigorously against the dangers that surrounded them. In the same way does the faithful Christian derive advantage even from the suggestions of the evil spirit, and by the habit of resisting temptation become more firmly established in the practice of virtue. As to the doctrine and worship acknowledged by the members of the priesthood anterior to

* Bishop Whittingham very learnedly tells us: "In their (Catholic) books of devotion, while a part of it (the canon) is translated, *as if it were the whole* (see *Ursuline Manual*, &c. *approved by the Rt. Rev. Dr. Hughes*, New York, 1840, page 101, ss), a part is cunningly kept back, because it makes mention of facts and implies doctrines that it would be *most inconvenient* to have constantly before them. Let this be disproved, if it can." It is difficult here to conjecture what the writer wishes us to disprove. If he allude to the *motive* for omitting the words of consecration in the U. Manual, we deny the assertion as utterly gratuitous: 1. Because in many prayer-books *all* the words of consecration are to be found. See *Roman Missal*, in English; *Holy Week; Paroissien Rom.* in French, &c. 2. The people not being the consecrators of the bread and wine, there is no necessity to place the formula required for this in the prayer-books. It would be no convenience whatever for the Catholic clergy to withhold from the notice of the people any doctrine of the Church, because the people believe the *real presence*, and every thing else that the clergy believe; but we may conceive that it is very convenient for *certain* bishops and clergymen to talk of a *sacrifice, real presence*, &c. at one time, and a few days after, to explain the whole matter away.

"But be it observed," says Bishop Whittingham, "the assertion is made in the text, of times preceding the reformation. Does the Romish critic venture to admit that his communion at the present day, in this country, is answerable for all that may be truly proved against portions of the western and eastern Churches 'in the sixth and following centuries?'" To this we answer *yes*, if these portions were in communion with the see of Rome; because the doctrine and worship of the Catholic Church have never changed. They are now what they were in the sixth and following centuries. "Does he venture to affirm that even now, as much of the mass as is laid before the people, say in the 'Ursuline Manual,' would be entrusted to them in Sicily or Malta, where Rome has the complete spiritual dominion she so much affects?" We answer *most assuredly.*

* See pages 172—182.

† Priesthood in the Church, 2 edit. p. 21, *note.*

the reformation, it is the glory of the Catholic clergy in the United States to coincide perfectly with them and with their successors on the other side of the Atlantic; because, as we have before observed, the doctrine and worship of the Catholic Church have never varied.

5. We have now reached the last inconsistency that was imputed to Bishop Whittingham, and which consisted on the one hand in advocating an authority in the minister to teach the people, and on the other in leaving that teaching to the final judgment of his hearers. In endeavoring to repel this charge the bishop has been as unsuccessful as in his other attempts at explanation. He accuses us of having miscited his words, and then entering upon distinctions which are rather difficult of comprehension, he tells us that the people are judges, "whether they, each one as he is to give account of himself to God, are to receive certain portions of his (the minister's) teaching as that of Christ." Afterwards he remarks: "many things a pastor may teach which his people are not bound to receive as the voice of Christ. But they are bound, at their soul's peril, to reject nothing for which the Bible rightly interpreted, is his warrant. Rightly interpreted the Bible can only be, in and by the Church."*

Whatever may be thought by others of this solution of the difficulty, we must acknowledge for our part that we do not understand it, and we shall briefly mention our objections. 1. Bishop Whittingham admits that the people are to judge whether they should receive certain portions of the pastor's teaching as that of Christ, and are bound to reject nothing for which the Bible is his warrant. Now, we ask, how are they to judge of this, unless by comparing the teaching of the pastor with the teaching of the Bible? and if they have the right, as the bishop says, to institute this inquiry for the satisfaction of their minds, what becomes of the pastor's authority as a representative of Christ? But he will, perhaps, inform us, that the Church has settled the meaning of the scriptures, and the people may judge of the pastor's orthodoxy by comparing it with the doctrine of the Church. Where will they find this doctrine of their Church? We have already observed that the sense of the thirty-nine articles has never been determined, and that to this day they are explained in at least four different ways.* We know that in the Protestant Episcopal Church the office of bishop is considered by some an essential order of the priesthood, while among others† it is looked upon as a distinction, unnecessary for communion with the Church of Christ. We know that the book of Common Prayer authorizes the people, in the recitation of the *Apostles' Creed*, the most venerable formula of Christian faith, to modify one of its articles, or even to omit it altogether.‡ Even were the teaching of the Church well ascertained, we contend that it is incapable of setting the mind of the people at rest upon the subject of religion, because the Protestant Episcopalian believes that the decision of no pastor or bishop, nor of all the pastors or bishops collectively, can determine with certainty the meaning of the Bible, and consequently, when the people hear the doctrinal expositions of their pastor, even if they are assured that his teaching is in accordance with that of their Church, they are still in a state of uncertainty whether the doctrine proposed to them is true or false. The charge, therefore, which we brought against the bishop of having asserted a contradiction remains in all its force. He recommends a pastor to the people as the representative of Christ, and enjoins upon them to hear him as they would hear his Master, and at the same time he assures us that they are "judges whether they are to receive certain portions of his teaching as that of Christ." He again affirms that the people are bound to reject nothing for which the Bible, rightly interpreted, is the pastor's warrant, that the Bible can be rightly interpreted, only in and by the Church, and at the same time he allows the people to believe that their Church

* Priesthood, &c. second edition, p. 27, *note*.

* See Westminster Review, No. 130, American edition.

† Bishop Johns' Farewell Sermon.

‡ Book of Common Prayer, p. 25, Phil. edit.

is fallible, that it may lead them into error, and, therefore, that its interpretations of the scripture may be erroneous, while their own individual interpretation may be correct. The reflecting Christian will perceive the vast difference between this inconsistent view and the Catholic principle. The Catholic believes that his Church is infallible in its decisions, and when the pastor is in communion with this Church, he bows assent to an infallible authority, rendered such by the promise of Christ that the gates of hell "will never prevail against his Church, and that he himself will abide with it forever."

Here we discover a *real and true freedom* of the mind, a consistency which places the Christian at rest by an adherence to incontrovertible principles; but that a Protestant Episcopalian bishop who believes his Church to be fallible, should call himself a representative of Christ in the office of teaching, and assert that the Bible can only be rightly interpreted in and by the Church, is a contradictory assumption which at once convicts him of what he alleges against the Catholic Church, a disposition *to bind the intellect of the laity.* W.

DEVOTION TO THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

TRANSLATED FROM A RECENT PASTORAL LETTER OF CARDINAL DE BONALD.

WHEN the Christian religion came forth on Calvary from the blood of Jesus Christ, she appeared in the world with an aspect as austere as her language; and, daughter of the man of sorrows, she received for her inheritance but a crown of thorns; her hands bore no other sceptre than the cross. But this stern appearance would have been too terrible if the Saviour had not given to religion, from her cradle, a companion whose mildness would temper her severity, whose charms would lead us to forget the rigor of her laws, and to support the heaviness of her yoke. This companion, my dear brethren, was the devotion to the Blessed Virgin. United by the bonds of a common origin and the same vocation, these two sisters, joining hands, descended together from the holy mountain, to devote themselves to the conquest of souls. From that time, wherever the standard of salvation has been planted, the ensigns of Mary have been unfolded. Jesus in taking possession of a heart, made his mother reign there with him, and these two sacred names have become inseparable on the lips of a Christian, as they are in the highest heavens, in the canticles of the angels. The history of our Church will bear testimony to what I say. When in the first days of Christianity, bishops came from the east to instruct your fathers in the faith and traditions of the apostles, were not the shores of your rivers, in receiving that precious deposit, hallowed with the devotion to the mother of God? Was it not in the catacombs of Gallic Rome that the first altar was raised in honor of the queen of angels? Did not the echoes of your hills first repeat that invocation, by which the glorious Irenæus saluted Mary as the advocate of sinners? Yes, it was amid the flames of persecution, amid burning piles and torturing racks, that this consoling devotion was established, which has been faithfully transmitted in this diocess through the lapse of ages; and the eloquent appeals of your martyred pontiffs from that time planted in the hearts of the people the germ of that confidence in Mary, which has been so happily developed, and to which the inhabitants of this country have so often been and will hereafter perhaps be often indebted for their safety during the most trying evils.

Ah! permit me to say, beloved brethren, at the beginning of a season which seems to menace us with additional sufferings, permit me to say that devotion to Mary is a

consolation, and a hope for the afflicted. Permit me to revive, by the most pious and solemn demonstrations, that worship which aided our ancestors to support the most painful adversities. Will we not turn our grateful looks towards that celebrated sanctuary, where a tender mother watches so lovingly over her cherished family, where reigns the powerful queen whose hand opposed a dike to the impetuosity of the waves, and arrested in its angry mission that mysterious disease which would have traversed your city, only to levy among all classes and all ages, a frightful tribute of blood and tears?

Devotion to the immaculate Virgin, seems to have been principally established in favor of the unfortunate, and for the purpose of sweetening the bitterness of adversity; because this devotion has for its object the most afflicted of mothers, the mother of grief. The Christian can express to her no pains that she has not experienced, he can relate to her no misfortune that has not been surpassed in the sufferings of her life; he cannot pour into her bosom the troubles that oppress him, without an assurance from her, that no afflictions have ever been like unto her afflictions; and if she has been raised to the summit of glory, it was only after having been plunged into an ocean of sorrow.

Why is the devotion to Mary propagated at the present day with so much pomp and rapidity? Why those fervent invocations of the faithful to the immaculate heart of Mary, and that continual recourse to her powerful intercession? The true Catholic, as it were, no longer prays to Jesus except through the instrumentality of Mary; there are no festivals for them without her; it would almost appear that without her there is no hope for them. Her name is incessantly on their lips, and her image is engraved upon every heart. The Church, far from opposing, encourages these raptures of piety, and from his agitated bark, Peter turns his eyes continually upon the *Ocean's Star*. It would seem that God had confided to his mother the exercise of his almighty power, and that the hands of this pure Virgin could alone dispense to Jew and Gentile the rays of truth and the waters of grace.

There is no doubt, beloved brethren, that because we have reached the unhappy times in which we live, the Holy Ghost who will assist the Church until the consummation of ages, has rekindled among the faithful a lively confidence in Mary, and propagated under a thousand different forms, and as many various denominations, the devotion to this queen of angels. Does it not pertain to the economy of his providential care for the Church, to dispense his assistance the more abundantly, as the dangers that beset her in her passage through the world are more numerous? At the appearance of a new enemy, has she not always received from Christ her spouse an additional armor for the conflict?

When we cast our eyes abroad to look for that progress in well-being, that is proclaimed with so much eloquence by the writers of our age, we witness only a more scandalous profanation of the Lord's day, a more revolting licentiousness in literature and the arts; an increasing boldness of that doctrine which has ceased to be Catholic, and can scarcely be called Christian; a cupidity which absorbs the soul of man, or an egotism which chills the heart. In our eyes these are the baneful causes which heap upon our heads the burning coals of the divine anger, and which produce in the depths of society those moaning sounds, the forerunners of the volcanic eruption. But where is the intercession sufficiently powerful to avert the anger of heaven? Who will protect us against the blow which we have merited? Nothing less efficient is required, beloved brethren, to implore our pardon, than the voice which so often commanded the master of the universe when he had become for us an humble and a little child. The arms which so often carried the ruler of the earth, when become the servant of us all, must snatch the thunder from the hands of an irritated God; and the heart which gave to the humanity of the word that precious blood shed on Calvary, will move the heart of our indignant Father. It is enough to tell you, that in these days of confusion and indifference we need the powerful Virgin for our advocate and support! Behold how the Spirit of God, who

wishes not the death of the sinner, but his salvation, awakens every where a strong confidence in Mary, how he inclines the Catholic people to approach the heart of their mother, there to seek an asylum and protection! A pious instinct leads them to repeat, from one extremity of the Church to the other, that touching invocation, "*show thyself a mother to us*, and may our prayers through thee be heard by him who in being born for us, chose to be born thy Son."

It was not enough to reanimate among the faithful the devotion to the Blessed Virgin, God, who seems to have confided our destinies to her hands, has indicated to us the sure way of making our devotion agreeable to her, and of rendering her more attentive to our prayers. And could there be any thing more acceptable to this Virgin of virgins, than to celebrate her spotless purity, than to proclaim her exempt from all stain, even that of our common origin? Is not this perfect innocence her most magnificent privilege? Does it not place her above the dignity of the mother of God, and the queen of heaven? Is not an exemption from the least stain of sin, more valuable to her than the immortal crown which encircles her brow? To supplicate her then in the name of her immaculate conception, is a pledge of finding access to her heart, and of meeting with a favorable attention to our wants and supplications.

The Church has well understood this subject, for she speaks to us incessantly of the spotless purity of Mary, and invites all her children to have recourse to her immaculate heart. She shows that heart to the most guilty, as a sanctuary which, far from being denied them, is the refuge where the divine mercy awaits them; and the name of our mother, that name hallowed among all generations, she does not wish to be pronounced, without the recollection that its splendor was never tarnished by the breath of the infernal serpent. She has regulated that the exemption of Mary from original sin should be solemnly proclaimed in her liturgy at the moment when the blood of the immaculate lamb, the source of all redemption is about to flow upon our altars. In fine, she encourages her bishops to petition the apostolic see, to obtain the power of celebrating, without any restrictions, that feast so beautiful in the eyes of angels and of men, the immaculate conception of Mary.

In hearing us speak in these exalted terms of the holy Virgin, will our separated brethren renew against us the ancient charge of idolatry? Will they accuse us of paying to the mother the same homages as to the Son, and of associating them in the same praises and the same worship? Ah! may our right hand wither before we subscribe to these impious sentiments, which are attributed to us; may our tongue cleave to our palate, sooner than profess so gross an error! How sublime soever may be the perfections of Mary, how elevated soever her dignity, whatever privileges may adorn her blessed soul, she is not less with us at the feet of him who alone is worthy of adoration, because he alone has a sovereign dominion over all beings. She is a creature like us, and far superior to us, but there is an infinite space between her and her Creator. If we owe her a certain respect because she has brought forth *our* Saviour and *hers*, we owe adoration only to that Being who is sovereignly independent. To render to Mary the worship which is due to God alone, would be closing the heart of our mother to us, abjuring our Catholic belief, and excluding ourselves from the kingdom of heaven. If we wear on our hearts the sweet image of the immaculate Virgin, we raise our hearts to him who alone could send so perfect a being upon earth; and the remembrance of the heroic virtues she has practised, forcibly animates us to retrace them in our conduct. Do our separated brethren deprive themselves of the consolation of beholding on canvass, the cherished features of her who has given them birth? And is this contemplation a sacrilegious adoration? If we raise a temple in honor of Mary, it is that we may go there to thank the author of every perfect gift, for the graces he has lavished on this incomparable Virgin. If we address ourselves to her merciful heart, this heart is not for us the source of grace; it is but the

mysterious channel of it. Such is our doctrine, which at once repels and refutes the charge of idolatry and superstition.

Let us compassionate, beloved brethren, let us compassionate sincerely our separated brethren, for not acknowledging the sweet and consoling devotion to Mary. Her sacred name which, for a child of the Church, is a salutary balm to the wounds of the most afflicted heart, is never heard on their lips. Let us compassionate them; and let us recommend these wandering sheep to their mother, whom they do not love. For you, Catholic families, let Mary be in the midst of you as a model for all situations of life, as the mother of your children, as the mistress of your dwellings, as the guardian of your fire-sides. Desolate mothers, press to your lips the image of the mother of sorrows; it will impart a secret virtue which will console you. You who are stretched upon the bed of suffering, turn your dying eyes towards the mother of mercy: a ray of hope will fall from her cherished looks, and will inspire your dejected hearts with hope and resignation. Let Mary be for us all the confidant of our pains and our joys; let our life with its struggles and sorrows be consecrated to her, and let it glide on under her maternal protection! May our last sigh be sent forth with those expiring words of St. Thomas of Canterbury, falling under the sword of his assassins: "To God and to Mary!"

INTELLIGENCE.

FOREIGN.

Rome.—The Rev. Father Alexander, the superior of the congregation of the Redemptorists, in America, lately arrived in Rome from Baltimore, accompanied by three American youths, who are to be placed in the Noviciate of the Congregation at Vienna. They were presented to the holy father, who manifested much pleasure on being informed that the Redemptorists had already established five houses in America. The Rev. Father Alexander was for a long time the superior of the house in Belgium.—*Tablet.*

Berlin.—The queen of Prussia has publicly declared herself in favor of the proposed establishment in Berlin of the sisters of the Order of St. Clara, and has promised them her patronage.—*Id.*

Guinea.—The following circular respecting the mission of Guinea has been sent us.—*Id.*

"Of all holy works," says Saint Dionysius, "that of co-operating in the salvation of souls is the holiest and most divine; great then must be the excellence of those Catholic missions which carry the gospel light amongst unbelieving and contradicting people, and point out to them the way, the truth, and the life. And if every other Catholic mission has calls for the sympathies and co-operation of the faithful, how much more imperiously are they claimed by that mission which is rendered so painful and laborious, and difficult to those who cultivate it by the insalubrity of the climate, by the privation of every comfort, or even convenience of life, by the difficult variety of its languages, and by many other obstacles to success scarcely to be met with elsewhere? Such is the new mission of the Two Guineas, in the west of Africa, whose black and almost naked people live without house, or comfort, or civilization, in a state of almost utter barbarism. Although they acknowledge the existence of a Supreme Being, they are a prey to the wildest superstition. They worship the demons, they practise polygamy, they bury several of their slaves with their deceased masters; they are, in a word, immersed in all those worst vices which must accompany the most barbarous ignorance, and the absence of that blessed light of faith which alone can enlighten the darkness in which sin of old involved the human race. Nevertheless, among these unhappy people there now begin to manifest themselves a wonderful movement towards our holy religion, and a marked respect for, and attachment to her ministers, the first fruits, no doubt, of that heavenly grace which seems to have chosen this as the time of their conversion. Already have the missioners the pleasure of seeing at Cape Palmas from two to three hundred of these poor barbarians come every Sunday with eager desire to be initiated in the mysteries of our faith, and to embrace the truth; and at the same time other distant

tribes are sending to them to desire that they would hasten to come and dwell among them. Great has been the consolation thus afforded to the vicar apostolic, and most eagerly would he fly in every direction to satisfy the desires of his beloved Africans, to instruct them and bathe them in the salutary waters of baptism. But, with only one companion, how can he answer every call? How learn all their languages, various as their tribes? How visit usefully a country of greater extent than the British Islands? He has then believed it to be expedient to leave the mission to the care of his companion for a very short time, whilst he comes to Europe to receive blessing and new authority from the father of the faithful, and to implore his fellow-christians to lend him the succours which he so much needs. As prayer is the principal means for the conversion of souls, the Right Rev. Dr. Barron, vicar apostolic of Guinea, with the warmest earnestness of his heart recommends his mission to the fervent prayers of all the faithful; but in an especial manner he implores of the clergy to remember it in the holy sacrifice, and to recommend it to the prayers of their flocks, and from the holy religious he desires a particular remembrance in their public and private suffrages. He even flatters himself with a strong hope that the holy zeal for God's glory and the salvation of souls so dearly purchased by him, which is now moving so many young apostles from their native shores in search of spiritual conquest, will direct some generous spirits amongst them to this new mission, where success is so certain, and labor, and danger, and privations, and every material for glorious merit for eternity so abundant. But thirteen missioners have as yet offered themselves. And when he shows the difficulty of conveying even this small number to the field of their labors, he believes he will not appeal to the charity of the faithful in vain. The missioner must carry out with him not only all that is necessary for the celebration of the divine mysteries and administration of the sacraments, but every object by which life may be defended or supported—the very materials for erecting his hut, bed furniture, clothes, medicine, and even provisions for several months, a boat for passing lakes and rivers, implements of husbandry, and tools and other instruments of different trades, &c.; so that at a moderate calculation the necessary expenditure for bringing a missioner to his labors will be near two hundred pounds. Need he say more to prove the extreme want of his mission, and how abundant should be for so holy a charity the contributions of those to whom God has given the riches of this world?

"Contributions, however small, will be thankfully received by Right Rev. Dr. Kenrick, bishop of Philadelphia.

"†EDWARD, *Bishop of Constantina,*
"Vicar Apostolic of Guinea.

"Irish College, Rome, Feast of St. Charles."

Catholicism in Great Britain.—We glean the following from the Catholic Directory and Annual Register for the year 1843. The number of chapels in England, Wales, and Scotland, is stated to be five hundred and seventy-one—of which four hundred and ninety-two are in England, eight in Wales, and seventy-one in Scotland, besides twenty-seven stations in the latter country, at which divine service is performed. The English counties in which the chapels are most numerous, are Lancashire, ninety-six; Yorkshire, fifty-eight; Staffordshire, thirty-two; Middlesex, twenty-four; Northumberland, twenty-four; Warwickshire, nineteen; Durham, seventeen; Hampshire, thirteen, and Cheshire, twelve. In England there are eight Catholic colleges—viz., St. Edmund's, Hertfordshire; St. Peter's, St. Paul's, and St. Gregory's, Somersetshire; Stonyhurst, Lancashire; St. Mary's, Staffordshire; Ushaw College, Durham; and St. Lawrence's, Yorkshire. In Scotland, one—viz., St. Mary's, Blairs, Kincardineshire. The number of convents is twenty-six, of monasteries, three. The total number of missionary priests in Great Britain, including those in England who have no fixed mission, is stated to be seven hundred and thirty-three—viz., in England, six hundred and eighty-eight, in Scotland, eighty-five.

Truth Teller.

FRANCE.—During the last four weeks, ten French priests of the Foreign Missionary Society have set out for various destinations. Two are gone to India; two as directors of the General Missionary College established at Pulo-Penag; two are to endeavor to penetrate into Cochin China; one is to go to Siam, and the others to Macao, preparatory to joining the missionaries in China.—*True Tablet.*

DOMESTIC.

ARCHDIOCESS OF BALTIMORE.—*Regulations for Lent.*—The following extract is from a circular addressed to the reverend clergy by the most Rev. Dr. Eccleston.

"The regulations for the ensuing lent will be the same as last year. The use of flesh meat, accordingly, will be allowed at any time on Sundays, and at one meal on Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays, with the exception of the

first four days, and all holy week including Palm Sunday."

Mount St. Mary's College.—A meeting of the professors and students of Mount St. Mary's College, was held on the 20th January, 1843, to take into consideration the propriety and means of erecting a suitable monument to the memory of the Right Rev. John Dubois, the founder of Mount St. Mary's College.

On motion, George H. Miles, of Baltimore, was called to the chair, and explained the object of the meeting: a secretary was elected, and it was then

Resolved, That a monument be erected at Mount St. Mary's to the Rt. Rev. John Dubois, founder of Mount St. Mary's College and Seminary, and father of the institution of the Sisters of Charity in this country.

Resolved, That we, the professors and students of Mount St. Mary's College, will contribute the sum of four hundred dollars.

Resolved, That a committee of nine students of the college be appointed to determine on the plan of the monument, and the means of erecting it, and that the president and vice-president of the college be invited to give their advice and co-operation to this committee.

Messrs. George H. Miles and Joseph J. O'Donnell, of Baltimore, Louis S. Se. Bourgeois, of Louisiana, Thomas E. Irby, of Alabama, John F. Ennis, of Washington, D. C., William F. Tehan, of Frederick, M. D, Francis X. Byerly, of Brooklyn, N. Y., Daniel Beltzhoover, of Pittsburg, Pa. and William George Read, Jun. of Baltimore, were named as the committee, with the approbation of the meeting.

Resolved, That a circular letter be addressed by the committee to the former pupils of Mr. Dubois, at the mountain and valley, and in general to all the friends and admirers of this good and venerated man, inviting them to co-operate in erecting an appropriate and durable monument to his memory, as a testimony of gratitude for his great services to the cause of education and of charity, and an expression of respect for the noble virtues which adorned his character.

The Rev. John McCloskey, Vice-President and Treasurer of Mount St. Mary's College, was appointed Treasurer of the Monument committee, and accepted the appointment. It was further

Resolved, That the editors of the various Catholic papers throughout the country be requested to publish these proceedings.—*U. S. Catholic Miscellany.*

Diocess of New York.—*Ordinations at St. John's College.*—On Sunday, the 29th January, the feast of St. Francis of Sales, Messrs. Laurence Carroll, Richard Kein, William Hogan, James Keaveny, Anthony Farley, and Francis Donahue were raised to the sublime dignity of the priesthood, in the chapel of the Blessed Virgin attached to the college.—*N. Y. Freeman's Journal.*

Catechetical.—*The Banner of the Cross* cannot reconcile the Catholic practice of praying to *God alone* for *mercy,* with the petitions which we address to the blessed Virgin, and in which she is styled the *mother of mercy. Answer:* In all prayers to God, we recognize him as the only source of every good gift; in all prayers to the blessed Virgin and the saints, we address them merely as our *helpers,* that by their prayers they may obtain for us the graces we desire. Would it be too strong language to call the editor of the *Banner* a *merciful* man? If not, he certainly should understand the propriety of styling the blessed Virgin, the *mother of mercy.*
See page 189.

EDITORIAL REMARKS.

In consequence of the unusual length of several articles in this number of the Magazine, our readers will find but a small space devoted to intelligence. For the same reason we have reluctantly omitted our customary notices of books. We acknowledge the receipt of "St. Bernard and his beloved Jerusalem," from a learned correspondent; number one of the "Catholic Poets of England" from the same author, numbers three and four of "Catholic Melodies" from the pleasing and instructive writer over the signature of Moïna, and several other contributions which claim our thanks, and will be published as soon as our space will permit.

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
3 8151 001 18610 2

LIBRARY
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
BRIGHTON, MASS.